

**Correspondence ID:** 2001    **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.  
The gulf oil spill only shines a laser on the precarious state of our shoreline.... SO MUCH IS AT RISK.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2002    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 08:00:00  
**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:** 2003    **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 have vacationed in the Outer Banks for the past several years and one of the highlights of our trips is spending time on the beaches; in our ORV and on foot. Being an avid bird-lover, a large part of the beach experience for me is watching the shorebirds. With each passing year, I wonder how all the ORVs have been impacting the beaches, nest sites, and cleanliness (disposed fishing line, etc.). If we restrict more beaches for non-ORV use, then hopefully a better balance can be obtained. An alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2004    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 08:00:01  
**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:** 2005    **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 writing as someone who spends vacation time there and at other national seashores, observing wildlife and supporting local business with my vacation expenditures.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs are given an unfair advantage in access over non-ORV users and wildlife. Allowing ORV's on 76 percent of the seashore is just plain unfair and disruptive to wildlife that rely on beaches to survive. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for . Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families 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. Recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2006    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Farmer, Thomas D  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 08:02:07  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Mr. Murray,  
NPS Resource Management Pedestrian / ORV Closure Policies Address the Least Significant Factor Affecting Nest Survival with Little Chance to Have more than Negligible Impact ?for example: ? AMOY Nest Failures are Predominately due to Non-human Events ? Mammalian Predation: 54% ? Storm / Lunar Tides: 29% ? Nest Abandonment: 6% ? Avian Predation: 5% ? Ghost Crab Predation: 3% ? Human Interference: 3% Insignificant Impact  
Creating huge buffers for birds that are not on the ESA is impacting humans. Why aren't alternatives being promoted? I would recommend educating the public in reference to respecting wildlife and sharing the beach. This may cost more money than just shutting down access, but it will be money well spent.  
The restrictions on access are having an adverse affect on the birds. People don't see the Piping Plover as a wonder of nature, but as a barrier to their beloved beaches. This is only going to get worse as more and more closures happen when more birds decide to nest in prime recreational areas. I think it is incumbent on the NPS to find ways for the birds and humans to share the beach. Think outside the box of restricting ORV access. How about working with the OBPA and NCBBA to adopt nesting areas? Empowering members to actively monitor sites while reducing buffer zones. They are out there everyday.  
My college degree is in biology. I have been visiting Hatteras Island for the past 35 years. I learned to respect nature by spending time on the beaches of Hatteras Island.  
Don't deny access to future nature lovers.  
Sincerly,  
Dave Farmer

**Correspondence ID:** 2007    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.30,2010 08:29:36  
**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:** 2008    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.30,2010 08:29:36  
**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:** 2009    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.30,2010 08:29:36  
**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:** 2010    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 08:29:36  
**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:** 2011    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 08:29:42  
**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:** 2012    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 08:29:42  
**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:** 2013    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 08:29:43  
**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:** 2014    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 08:29:43  
**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.  
Given the disaster we see in now in the Gulf of Mexico, protecting sensitive nesting areas on all of coasts should be a top priority for the National Park Service. If we lose the nesting areas as projected in Louisiana and the Gulf coast, we can't afford to do anything to damage other nesting areas. Cape Hatteras may be one of the few areas we have left!  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2015    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 08:29:44  
**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:** 2016    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 08:29:44  
**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. ANOTHER SAD BUT TRUE OCCURANCE OF HUMANS TAKING UP TOO MUCH OF NATURE'S DOMAIN...I WANT TO HELP IN ANYWAY, I ALSO WISH MORE HUMANS WWERE NOT SO THOUGHTLESS OF OUR ONCE BEAUTIFUL EARTH

**Correspondence ID:** 2017    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,30,2010 08:29:44

**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:** 2018    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,30,2010 08:29:44

**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:** 2019    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,30,2010 08:29:51

**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:

0009352

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

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

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2020    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 08:29:51

**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:** 2021    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 00:00:00

**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:** 2022    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 08:59:42

**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:** 2023    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 08:59:42

**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:** 2024    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,30,2010 08:59:42

**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:** 2025    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,30,2010 08:59:42

**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:** 2026    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,30,2010 08:59:42

**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:** 2027    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,30,2010 08:59:42

**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:** 2028    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,30,2010 08:59:42

**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:** 2029    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,30,2010 08:59:42

**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:** 2030    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,30,2010 08:59:51

**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:** 2031    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,30,2010 08:59:51

**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:** 2032    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,30,2010 08:59:51

**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:** 2033    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,30,2010 08:59:51

**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:** 2034    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,30,2010 08:59:52

**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:** 2035    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,30,2010 08:59:52

**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:** 2036    **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.

Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species.

Wildlife protection must be based on the best 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 listening.

**Correspondence ID:** 2037    **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.

As a someone who has visited Cape Hattares National Seashore and supported the local tourist economy, I am writng to encourage that the ORVs be restricted as per the alternate plan. This resource must be managed to preserve wildlife and allow access for those who appreciate the solitude and wildlife viewing without ORVs..

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

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be allowed access to 76 percent of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This is unfair and excessive!!! This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

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

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

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

**Correspondence ID:** 2038    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,30,2010 08:59:59

**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:** 2039    **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.  
Dear Mr. Murray,  
Thank you for listening to my comments on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2040    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 09:00:00  
**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:** 2041    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 09:00:00  
**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:** 2042    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 09:00:00  
**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:** 2043    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 09:00:00  
**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:** 2044    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Latham, Judith C  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 09:14:17  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 1. Predator Control/ Vegetation Removal around the salt ponds  
I disagree with the proposed continued trapping and slaughter of native predators. I do agree, however, with removal of exotic mammals. Predators have thrived here because THEIR natural predators, humans, have been so widely restricted (particularly at night when risk is greatest) and because the NPS has permitted vegetation to grow around the ponds. Why is it OK to tamper with nature in some instances (killing mammals) but not in others (clearing vegetation)? Vegetation removal would provide more and safer feeding areas for plovers.  
2. 1000 Meter Radius Buffers for Piping Plovers (p. 121-127)  
This is preposterously excessive and inflexible for a threatened species which will soon be delisted. The unfledged chick buffer should be adjusted as the brood moves to find food, not simply expanded. Show me the science. As there has NEVER been a piping plover death attributable to an ORV

driver, there should be drive-thru access corridors.

3. Prohibition of Family Pet Dogs (p. 136)

The DEIS is contradictory on what policy will be. I agree that unleashed pets should not be allowed, but there is no reason at all why leashed pets and their families should be punished.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2045    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 09:29:42  
**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:** 2046    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 09:29:42  
**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:** 2047    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 09:29:42  
**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:** 2048    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 09:29:43  
**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:** 2049    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 09:29:43  
**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:** 2050    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 09:29:43  
**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:** 2051    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 09:29:55  
**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:** 2052    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 09:29:55  
**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:** 2053    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 09:29:55  
**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. These birds and animals deserve our protection as much as humanly possible. Off-Road vehicle drivers should not be allowed to harm our wildlife for their pleasure!

**Correspondence ID:** 2054    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.30,2010 09:30:13  
**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:** 2055    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.30,2010 09:30:13  
**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.  
Please note that not only will this protect wildlife, ORV are dangerous and result in many needless human injuries every year. Restriction of their use can only improve public safety and health...

**Correspondence ID:** 2056    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.30,2010 09:30:13  
**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:** 2057    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 09:30:22  
**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:** 2058    **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.  
Ce plan de rechange serait de fournir plus de possibilit?s pour des utilisations non-VHR sur les plages et le r?sultat en moins de perturbation de la faune, qui sont importantes pour moi.  
Les principes suivants devraient sous-tendre l'?laboration du parc de son plan final, devrait-il pas choisi d'adopter la variante D:  
\* Fournir un acc?s ?gal pour tous les visiteurs. Selon le plan de pr?f?rer le National Park Service, la variante F, VTT serait interdite toute l'ann?e sur seulement 16 des 68 miles de la plage totale Seashore. Cela ne repr?sente pas un juste ?quilibre pour les autres utilisateurs et de la faune. Si l'utilisation des VHR est autoris? dans le parc, au moins la moiti? de la plage doivent ?tre disponibles toute l'ann?e pour les utilisateurs non-VTT et de la faune. Combin?s avec plus trottoirs et des installations d'un meilleur acc?s, cette approche serait de fournir un acc?s ?quilibr? pour tous les visiteurs. Les pi?tons et les familles pourraient alors plus jouer en toute s?curit? la mer, et de la faune pourrait avoir une chance de rebond ? ses num?ros traditionnels et de diversit? dans le parc.  
\* Put Ressources naturelles abord. Protection des ressources naturelles et de la faune du littoral devrait venir en premier, et l'utilisation r?cr?ative devrait ?tre compatible avec cette protection. Le plan pr?f?r? ne parvient pas ? cr?er des zones ad?quates qui sont exempts de toute VHR utilisent annuellement pour la faune, y compris la reproduction, de migration et d'hivernage des esp?ces. protection de la faune doit ?tre fond? sur les meilleures informations scientifiques. tampons perturbation de la faune dans le plan pr?f?r?s sont minimales et devrait ?tre augment? si n?cessaire pour prot?ger les oiseaux nicheurs et les tortues marines.  
\* Fixer et atteindre des objectifs clairs pour le r?tablissement de la faune. Un plan doit inclure des objectifs clairs et des ?tapes pour la r?cup?ration de la faune. Lorsqu'il existe des objectifs de gestion dans le DEIS, ils ont besoin vetting plus approfondie, bas?e sur le potentiel de la mer pour nourrir les animaux sauvages plut?t que sur ses derni?res capacit?s d?grad?es. L'? les oiseaux, les tortues, et les plantes ne sont pas revenir comme pr?vu, sur la base des examens annuels, d'autres mesures de protection doivent ?tre mises en oeuvre jusqu'? ce que les objectifs de r?tablissement sont remplies. Ces objectifs et de gestion ad?quates pour les r?aliser, il convient de migration et d'hivernage des esp?ces ainsi que celles de reproduction.  
Je vous remercie de l'opportunit? de fournir ? ces commentaires. Je vais suivre les progr?s de vos efforts ? Cape Hatteras et attendons avec impatience un plan plus final ?quilibr? pour tous les visiteurs qui prot?ge mieux les ressources naturelles de la c?te.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2059    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 09:30:22  
**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,

0009365

migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2060    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 09:30:22  
**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:** 2061    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 09:30:30  
**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:** 2062    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 09:30:30  
**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:** 2063    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 09:30:30  
**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:** 2064    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 09:30:30  
**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:** 2065    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 09:40:25  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Michael B. Murray Superintendent  
Dear Mr. Murray:  
Please pass and implement this plan to block vehicles on the beaches of the Outer Banks - specifically on Hatteras Island!  
I moved to southeastern Virginia about a year ago. I still maintain my home in NC and have watched the numerous changes wrought on the Outer Banks over the years. I have seen beautiful "sleepy" fishing villages turned into built-up vacation hot-spots for spoiled "out-of-towners". I have lived and worked in the Outer Banks. I am well aware that, to a large degree, the area relies on the income generated by tourism.  
I whole-heartedly support tourism to the Outer Banks. The area has a beauty unmatched in many other areas of our country and should be shared and enjoyed with our country's citizens. There is however, a difference between the tourist who comes with their family to vacation for a week or two and the spoiled, short-sighted individuals who believe it is "ok" to damage crucial beaches in the name of their selfish choice of "recreation".  
These last few days, living in the Tidewater Virginia area, I have watched with disbelief and disgust, the various news reports of open forums conducted on this proposal. Each of these news reports have focused on what benefit Virginians might lose if this proposal is implemented. Hello?!? The Outer Banks was not created/formed to be anyone's personal playground! I have yet to see any responsible reporting to this area's citizenry regarding the ecological impact of ORVs on area beaches. Why is that I wonder?

0009367

I believe that those arguing that they have a right to use their ORVs to travel to secluded spots for "great fishing" represent a group of individuals who simply think of their own instant gratification - not of the long-term effects to the ecosystem of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore. I understand wanting to partake in the great sport of fishing - I too have enjoyed fishing over the years. What I do not understand or condone is the possible damage or worse, destruction of the delicate ecosystem in question just to support my hobby. We all must think beyond our short-term perceived "needs" and wants to the long-term health of our natural resources. Our beaches, with their varied flora and fauna ARE in fact one of America's greatest treasures and should be preserved for those generations who come after us.

I for one, am willing to sacrifice my short-term desire to use my ORV to bring my family to the various secluded spots along Hatteras. I choose to think and believe globally and long-term for all of those who will follow me in successive generations.

I implore you to preserve Cape Hatteras National Seashore by banning ORVs in ecologically sensitive areas. I believe future generations of Americans will thank you for it!!!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2066    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 09:59:47  
**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:** 2067    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 09:59:47  
**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.  
These wonderful places are irreplaceable. Save Them! sybil

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2068    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 09:59:47  
**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.  
I hope you will choose the "environmentally preferred" Alternative D to provide better access by pedestrians. Management of this area is critical for the survival of bird species that may be harmed by ORV.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this

approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

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

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2069    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 09:59:48  
**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.  
Please do something about off road vehicles and protect the nesting area for birds and sea turtles. Wild life can use all the help it can get now and thank you.Jean hooper.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2070    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 09:59:59  
**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:** 2071    **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 population growth in the United States means we need to step up our efforts to protect our wildlife. More people means more pressure on habitat. We need to protect it stringently.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2072    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 10:00:00  
**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:** 2073    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 10:00:00  
**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:** 2074    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 10:00:00  
**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. This is a right to life for all life issue.

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2075    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 10:00:00  
**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:** 2076    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 10:00:18  
**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:** 2077    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 10:00:20  
**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:** 2078    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 10:00:20  
**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:** 2079    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 10:00:20  
**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:** 2080    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 10:00:31  
**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:** 2081    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 10:00:38  
**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:** 2082    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,30,2010 10:00:38

**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 much better alternative plan 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.

These principles should be at the heart of the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2083    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,30,2010 10:00:38

**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.

best wishes Mininder kaur

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2084    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,30,2010 10:00:38

**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:** 2085    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 10:00:38  
**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.  
 I'm a photographer who has been almost run over by those dune buggies and other 4 wheel vehicles. The last time we were there, we vowed not to return because of the danger from ORV's. It's a beautiful place but not worth the chances of being hit.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2086    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 10:00:43  
**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:** 2087    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 10:00:43  
**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:** 2088    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 10:30:07  
**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:** 2089    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 10:30:07  
**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:** 2090    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 10:30:07  
**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:** 2091    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 10:30:08  
**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:** 2092    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 10:30:21  
**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:** 2093    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 10:30:21  
**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:** 2094    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 10:30:39  
**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:** 2095    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 10:30:39  
**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:** 2096    **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.  
I do not use ORV, and I do not plan to, yet I visit many of our National Parks, including the Cape Hatteras National Seashore. I do not like ORVs, or their pollution, or their noise. ORV use increases the amount of improperly disposed trash in wild areas. All these results of ORV use seriously degrades my enjoyment of natural areas because it damages the wildlife, land, and wild experience that I come to enjoy. Alternative D is the alternative I prefer.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding,

migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

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

The world is losing its wildlife at an alarming rate. Global warming is a grow threat because of the continued rise in the release of CO2, which ORVs exacerbate. The rise in sea level predicted to accompany rising global temperatures is a major threat to all our coasts. Noise pollution is a growing problem. What good is preserving wild areas if human use is allowed to degrade those very characteristics that make wild areas attractive? Please address these problems by restricting the use of ORVs on the Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

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

**Correspondence ID:** 2097    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,30,2010 10:30:40

**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:** 2098    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,30,2010 10:30:40

**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:** 2099    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,30,2010 10:59:57

**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:** 2100    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 10:59:57  
**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:** 2101    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 10:59:57  
**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:** 2102    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 10:59:57  
**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:** 2103    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,30,2010 10:59:58

**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:** 2104    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,30,2010 10:59:58

**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:** 2105    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,30,2010 11:00:14

**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:** 2106    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 11:00:14  
**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:** 2107    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 11:00:14  
**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:** 2108    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 11:00:14  
**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:** 2109    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,30,2010 11:00:15

**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:** 2110    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,30,2010 11:00:15

**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:** 2111    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,30,2010 11:30:01

**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:** 2112    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,30,2010 11:30:01

**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:** 2113    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,30,2010 11:30:02

**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:** 2114    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,30,2010 11:30:02

**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:** 2115    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,30,2010 11:30:02

**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:** 2116    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,30,2010 11:30:02

**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:** 2117    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,30,2010 11:30:02

**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:** 2118    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,30,2010 11:30:09

**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:** 2119    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,30,2010 11:30:11

**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:** 2120    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,30,2010 12:00:23

**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:** 2121    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 12:00:23  
**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.  
Please do the right thing for everyone to enjoy the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2122    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 12:00:23  
**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:** 2123    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 12:00:31  
**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:** 2124    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 12:00:58  
**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:** 2125    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 12:01:05  
**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:** 2126    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 12:01:23  
**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:** 2127    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 12:01:23  
**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:** 2128    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 12:01:23  
**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:** 2129    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 12:01:30  
**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:** 2130    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 12:01:37  
**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:** 2131    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 12:01:50  
**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:** 2132    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 12:02:09  
**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:** 2133    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 12:02:15  
**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:** 2134    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 12:02:15  
**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:** 2135    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 12:02:33  
**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:** 2136    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 12:02:33  
**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:** 2137    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 12:02:45  
**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:** 2138    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 12:02:57  
**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:** 2139    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 12:03:34  
**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:** 2140    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 12:03:39  
**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:** 2141    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 12:30:32  
**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:** 2142    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 12:30:44  
**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:** 2143    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 12:31:07  
**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:** 2144    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 12:31:07  
**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:** 2145    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 12:31:18  
**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:** 2146    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 12:31:24  
**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:** 2147    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 12:31:24  
**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:** 2148    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 12:31:32  
**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:** 2149    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 12:31:39  
**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:** 2150    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 12:32:41  
**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:** 2151    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 12:32:49  
**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:** 2152    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 12:32:57  
**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:** 2153    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 12:33:03  
**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:** 2154    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 12:33:10  
**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:** 2155    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 12:33:29  
**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:** 2156    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 12:33:36  
**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:** 2157    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 12:33:48  
**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:** 2158    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 12:33:48  
**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:** 2159    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 12:34:16  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** To Whom it May Concern (and this should concern everyone)  
I am an avid outdoor enthusiast and care deeply about our natural environment. I am, however, gravely concerned about the misguided attempts to protect several species of birds that nature, quite obviously, has selected for extinction. I believe that limiting human access, in any form, to our National Seashores is shortsighted and very narrow-minded. This is not to imply that our coastal environment should be a free-for-all. In fact, I fully support the enforcement and regulation on any abuses that may occur near the seashore, including excessive noise, excessive speed, disorderly conduct, treading on fragile dune grasses, and improper waste disposal. I do, however, believe that our National Seashores are treasures that should be enjoyed by all without restrictions, during any time of year, regardless of which piping plover or loggerhead turtle decided to nest there.  
I have enjoyed Cape Hatteras National Seashore in the off-season for the past several years, and I do enjoy the OHV access to the beaches. I see no

reason why to restrict this OHV access during the shoulder seasons. It is difficult for me to comment on the months of June, July and August, since I have never visited OBX during that time. I can say, however, that there are several beaches near my home that I frequent during the summer months and offer OHV access, and there does not seem to be any problem with the destruction of the natural environment.

This is a slippery slope that you are treading on. The National Seashores are designated to be public lands. Restricting access is not the correct path to follow.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2160    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 12:34:30  
**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:** 2161    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 12:34:37  
**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:** 2162    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 12:34:37  
**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:** 2163    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 12:34:37  
**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:** 2164    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 12:34:53  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** To Whom it May Concern, I would like to comment on the proposed pet/horse ban on the seashore from March 15 to July 31st. My husband and I run a very small horseback riding business on the beach in the area of Ramp 55 in Hatteras. Our business is the only way that some individuals get to experience the beach. We take children, elderly and handicapped individuals. We walk with the people and do not ride horses so that we can be there to answer questions and keep the horses in control. I do not believe our horses are a threat to the wildlife. On the contrary, it is a most natural way to experience the seashore. Our business and livelihood would be destroyed by the proposed ban.  
Respectfully,  
Suzie Scholten

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2165    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 12:34:55  
**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:** 2166    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 12:35:30  
**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.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

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

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

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

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

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

**Correspondence ID:** 2167    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.30,2010 12:35:47

**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:** 2168    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.30,2010 12:35:51

**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 result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

Thank you for the support of protection of wildlif. I myself am a birdwatcher ("birder"), and over the years, I have seen degradation of much habitat.

This is a loss for generations to come. We need to do all we can to be stewards of our resouces, not plunderers.

I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras. I support a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 2169    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.30,2010 12:41:28

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am in favor of reasonable measures to protect birds and turtles, like almost everyone who lives on these islands.

However, the 1,000 meter buffers for some species is absolutely, completely and totally unreasonable.

On our islands, one brood of Plovers at Ocracoke, in 2009, is the only group that has ever been observed to have chicks roam that far after hatching ... and they only did it once and never re-traced their steps! They simply had to go that far to get to a food source from the nest site, and once at the food site, they stayed there. So, how can it be reasonable to base policy on this one extreme case that has never been repeated on these islands?

Where is the reason and common sense in our policy makers?

How can it make sense to completely close a circle with A RADIUS OF 10 FOOTBALL FIELDS around every Piping Plover nest based on one observation of a brood who moved that far ONE TIME to get to food and then never left the food area until they could fly!!! Doesn't the NPS realize that, in many places, our island isn't even one football field wide? It's just that the NPS is either afraid of or too slothful to deal with the folks that have the money to hire expensive lawyers.

When we only have very few Plover nests each year, how difficult could it be for our Park Service folks to establish reasonable and flexible buffers around those nests and then modify them as the brood is observed in it's search for food to establish the protected area in whatever direction that turns out to be?

Contrast that with putting a fixed 20-football-field bubble over each pair observed "exhibiting nesting behavior" that stays in place, regardless, until their brood fledges?

Which seems like the most reasonable and effective management plan?

Which one seems like a "set it and forget it" BUREAUCRATIC PERSONIFICATION OF IRRESPONSIBILITY to both the birds and the people?

And, how is it good policy for the Park Service to refuse to consider many protected birds that are choosing to nest on predator-free dredge islands in the sound instead of the open beach when they count birds to determine success or failure of their policies?

What was wrong with the Interim ORV Plan or something akin to it? Where is the evidence that things were getting worse for birds and turtles on these islands? When the thriving, non-predator-threatened birds on our dredge islands are counted, THERE ISN'T ANY EVIDENCE!  
Come on NPS, stop cowering in front of the Audubon Society and start serving the public who will not stand for their Cape Hatteras National Seashore RECREATIONAL Area being turned into another National Wildlife Refuge! We already have Pea Island + Alligator River + many more ... enough already!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2170    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Cooper II, Gary D  
**Received:** Apr.30,2010 12:45:52  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Comments on Document 2010 03Mar 05 - Draft ORV Management Plan/EIS

After reviewing the proposed plan I have several comments that I would like to make regarding the extreme measures of restrictions being considered at Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area (CHNSRA). No other NPS seashore has ever had such extreme resource protection measures in place and the delicate balance between protection and accessibility has been kept in those instances. For your reference, Padre Island National Seashore (PAIS) founded September 28, 1962 is strikingly similar to CHNSRA both in geographic and wildlife make up. What PAIS does not have are total beach closures because of resource protection areas, enormous buffer zones. They have turtles that nest in the park just like CHNSRA. They have about 380 species of birds that have been observed there, this is approximately 45% of all bird species documented in North America. Included in that list is the Piping plover (10% of the world's population @ PAIS), Least Terns (8% of the North American population @PAIS), and the endangered Snowy Plover that call Padre their home -- at least for part of the year. This is because of the island's location on the central flyway, a major migratory route between the northern and southern habitats. CHNSRA bird populations pale in comparison to those numbers. Yet somehow the measures in place at PAIS are able to sufficiently strike a balance between humans and nature. The proposed plan for CHNSRA is overly restrictive for an insignificant percentage of the total population of wildlife that it is intended to protect. Addressing the proposed plan in its entirety, my request is that the CHNSRA final plan be modeled closely after the plan already in place at Padre Island for these many years. The PAIS plan strikes a fine balance between resource/wildlife protection and access to the resource(s) and there is no reason the very same plan would not work equally well at CHNSRA if not better.

Pertaining to specific areas in the proposed plan (Park Service preferred Alternative F) I will break my comments down into the following four areas?Corridors, Management Buffers, Non-Endangered Birds, and Turtle management.

? Corridors-DEIS Pages xii, xviii, and 468- The final plan should include corridors in both ML-1 and ML-2 portions of SMA's. Corridors are a vital tool in providing access while still managing resources. They provide a small path around temporary resource closures in order to provide access to open area that would otherwise be blocked. Corridors should be permitted throughout the seashore during the entire breeding and nesting season including ML-1 portions of SMA's. These corridors would provide valuable access without impairment or damage to protected resources. ? Management Buffers ?DEIS pages 121 to 127- The closures caused by the buffers as enumerated in the Park Service preferred Alternative F are larger and more restrictive than what are required by the various species recovery plans. For example, Piping Plover unfledged chicks, are given a protective buffer of a minimum of 1,000 meters in all directions. This 1,000 meter buffer represents a 500% increase over the standard 200 meter buffer enumerated the Piping Plover recovery plan. Buffers, or closures, are important management practices for species recovery. However, to have long term benefit for the wildlife and the visiting public, buffers must be based on peer-reviewed science. For example, the Piping Plover, a species classified as threatened and not endangered, is given a level of unprecedented protection in Alternative F. A 1,000 meter buffer in all directions represents over 771 acres. The DEIS does not cite any peer-reviewed science in supporting such closure. A more appropriate & effective buffer would be 200 meters.

? Non-Endangered Birds - DEIS pages 121 to 127- Non-endangered species, such as American Oystercatchers, Least Terns and Colonial Waterbirds are given Pre-Nesting closures and buffers up to 300 meters. Birds that are not listed as endangered should not be afforded the level of protection given to ESA (Endangered Species Act) protected species. Instead of 300 meter buffers for these birds, a more appropriate buffer would be 30 meters. Also, all birds in the same ecosystem of the seashore should be counted. This would include all the many birds on the dredge and spoil islands located just yards away and within sight of the seashore.

? Turtle Management - DEIS pages 125, and 392 to 396- DEIS claims North Carolina Wildlife Resources Commission turtle guidelines will be followed. The National Park Service should consider turtle management practices successfully used in other federal and state areas to achieve nesting success. More proactive measures include relocating nests to more desirable locations, which is routinely and successfully done in other areas. This concludes my remarks regarding the Draft ORV Management Plan/EIS. It is my sincere hope that my recommendations will be thoughtfully considered and addressed in the final rule. When these aforementioned items are contained within the final rule it will then be a true representation of a fine balance between resource protection and visitor access.

Thank you for all of your hard work that has and is yet to come. Gary D Cooper II

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2171    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Cooper, Laure A  
**Received:** Apr.30,2010 12:46:51  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Comments on Document 2010 03Mar 05 - Draft ORV Management Plan/EIS

After reviewing the proposed plan I have several comments that I would like to make regarding the extreme measures of restrictions being considered at Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area (CHNSRA). No other NPS seashore has ever had such extreme resource protection measures in place and the delicate balance between protection and accessibility has been kept in those instances. For your reference, Padre Island National Seashore (PAIS) founded September 28, 1962 is strikingly similar to CHNSRA both in geographic and wildlife make up. What PAIS does not have are total beach closures because of resource protection areas, enormous buffer zones. They have turtles that nest in the park just like CHNSRA. They have about 380 species of birds that have been observed there, this is approximately 45% of all bird species documented in North America. Included in that list is the Piping plover (10% of the world's population @ PAIS), Least Terns (8% of the North American population @PAIS), and the endangered Snowy Plover that call Padre their home -- at least for part of the year. This is because of the island's location on the central flyway, a major migratory route between the northern and southern habitats. CHNSRA bird populations pale in comparison to those numbers. Yet somehow the measures in place at PAIS are able to sufficiently strike a balance between humans and nature. The proposed plan for CHNSRA is overly restrictive for an insignificant percentage of the total population of wildlife that it is intended to protect. Addressing the proposed plan in its entirety, my request is that the CHNSRA final plan be modeled closely after the plan already in place at Padre Island for these many years. The PAIS plan strikes a fine balance between resource/wildlife protection and access to the resource(s) and there is no reason the very same plan would not work equally well at CHNSRA if not better.

Pertaining to specific areas in the proposed plan (Park Service preferred Alternative F) I will break my comments down into the following four areas?Corridors, Management Buffers, Non-Endangered Birds, and Turtle management.

? Corridors-DEIS Pages xii, xviii, and 468- The final plan should include corridors in both ML-1 and ML-2 portions of SMA's. Corridors are a vital tool in providing access while still managing resources. They provide a small path around temporary resource closures in order to provide access to open area that would otherwise be blocked. Corridors should be permitted throughout the seashore during the entire breeding and nesting season including ML-1 portions of SMA's. These corridors would provide valuable access without impairment or damage to protected resources. ? Management Buffers ?DEIS pages 121 to 127- The closures caused by the buffers as enumerated in the Park Service preferred Alternative F are larger and more restrictive than what are required by the various species recovery plans. For example, Piping Plover unfledged chicks, are given a protective buffer of a minimum of 1,000 meters in all directions. This 1,000 meter buffer represents a 500% increase over the standard 200 meter buffer enumerated the Piping Plover recovery plan. Buffers, or closures, are important management practices for species recovery. However, to have long term benefit for the wildlife and the visiting public, buffers must be based on peer-reviewed science. For example, the Piping Plover, a species classified as threatened and not endangered, is given a level of unprecedented protection in Alternative F. A 1,000 meter buffer in all directions represents over 771 acres. The DEIS

does not cite any peer-reviewed science in supporting such closure. A more appropriate & effective buffer would be 200 meters.

? Non-Endangered Birds - DEIS pages 121 to 127- Non-endangered species, such as American Oystercatchers, Least Terns and Colonial Waterbirds are given Pre-Nesting closures and buffers up to 300 meters. Birds that are not listed as endangered should not be afforded the level of protection given to ESA (Endangered Species Act) protected species. Instead of 300 meter buffers for these birds, a more appropriate buffer would be 30 meters. Also, all birds in the same ecosystem of the seashore should be counted. This would include all the many birds on the dredge and spoil islands located just yards away and within sight of the seashore.

? Turtle Management - DEIS pages 125, and 392 to 396- DEIS claims North Carolina Wildlife Resources Commission turtle guidelines will be followed. The National Park Service should consider turtle management practices successfully used in other federal and state areas to achieve nesting success. More proactive measures include relocating nests to more desirable locations, which is routinely and successfully done in other areas. This concludes my remarks regarding the Draft ORV Management Plan/EIS. It is my sincere hope that my recommendations will be thoughtfully considered and addressed in the final rule. When these aforementioned items are contained within the final rule it will then be a true representation of a fine balance between resource protection and visitor access.

**Correspondence ID:** 2172    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Cooper, Margaret A  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 12:47:25

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Comments on Document 2010 03Mar 05 - Draft ORV Management Plan/EIS

After reviewing the proposed plan I have several comments that I would like to make regarding the extreme measures of restrictions being considered at Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area (CHNSRA). No other NPS seashore has ever had such extreme resource protection measures in place and the delicate balance between protection and accessibility has been kept in those instances. For your reference, Padre Island National Seashore (PAIS) founded September 28, 1962 is strikingly similar to CHNSRA both in geographic and wildlife make up. What PAIS does not have are total beach closures because of resource protection areas, enormous buffer zones. They have turtles that nest in the park just like CHNSRA. They have about 380 species of birds that have been observed there, this is approximately 45% of all bird species documented in North America. Included in that list is the Piping plover (10% of the world's population @ PAIS), Least Terns (8% of the North American population @PAIS), and the endangered Snowy Plover that call Padre their home -- at least for part of the year. This is because of the island's location on the central flyway, a major migratory route between the northern and southern habitats. CHNSRA bird populations pale in comparison to those numbers. Yet somehow the measures in place at PAIS are able to sufficiently strike a balance between humans and nature. The proposed plan for CHNSRA is overly restrictive for an insignificant percentage of the total population of wildlife that it is intended to protect. Addressing the proposed plan in its entirety, my request is that the CHNSRA final plan be modeled closely after the plan already in place at Padre Island for these many years. The PAIS plan strikes a fine balance between resource/wildlife protection and access to the resource(s) and there is no reason the very same plan would not work equally well at CHNSRA if not better.

Pertaining to specific areas in the proposed plan (Park Service preferred Alternative F) I will break my comments down into the following four areas?Corridors, Management Buffers, Non-Endangered Birds, and Turtle management.

? Corridors-DEIS Pages xii, xviii, and 468- The final plan should include corridors in both ML-1 and ML-2 portions of SMA's. Corridors are a vital tool in providing access while still managing resources. They provide a small path around temporary resource closures in order to provide access to open area that would otherwise be blocked. Corridors should be permitted throughout the seashore during the entire breeding and nesting season including ML-1 portions of SMA's. These corridors would provide valuable access without impairment or damage to protected resources. ? Management Buffers ?DEIS pages 121 to 127- The closures caused by the buffers as enumerated in the Park Service preferred Alternative F are larger and more restrictive than what are required by the various species recovery plans. For example, Piping Plover unfledged chicks, are given a protective buffer of a minimum of 1,000 meters in all directions. This 1,000 meter buffer represents a 500% increase over the standard 200 meter buffer enumerated the Piping Plover recovery plan. Buffers, or closures, are important management practices for species recovery. However, to have long term benefit for the wildlife and the visiting public, buffers must be based on peer-reviewed science. For example, the Piping Plover, a species classified as threatened and not endangered, is given a level of unprecedented protection in Alternative F. A 1,000 meter buffer in all directions represents over 771 acres. The DEIS does not cite any peer-reviewed science in supporting such closure. A more appropriate & effective buffer would be 200 meters.

? Non-Endangered Birds - DEIS pages 121 to 127- Non-endangered species, such as American Oystercatchers, Least Terns and Colonial Waterbirds are given Pre-Nesting closures and buffers up to 300 meters. Birds that are not listed as endangered should not be afforded the level of protection given to ESA (Endangered Species Act) protected species. Instead of 300 meter buffers for these birds, a more appropriate buffer would be 30 meters. Also, all birds in the same ecosystem of the seashore should be counted. This would include all the many birds on the dredge and spoil islands located just yards away and within sight of the seashore.

? Turtle Management - DEIS pages 125, and 392 to 396- DEIS claims North Carolina Wildlife Resources Commission turtle guidelines will be followed. The National Park Service should consider turtle management practices successfully used in other federal and state areas to achieve nesting success. More proactive measures include relocating nests to more desirable locations, which is routinely and successfully done in other areas. This concludes my remarks regarding the Draft ORV Management Plan/EIS. It is my sincere hope that my recommendations will be thoughtfully considered and addressed in the final rule. When these aforementioned items are contained within the final rule it will then be a true representation of a fine balance between resource protection and visitor access.

**Correspondence ID:** 2173    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 13:00:18

**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:** 2174    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 13:00:18  
**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:** 2175    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 13:00:23  
**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:** 2176    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 13:00:48  
**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:** 2177    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 13:00:56  
**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:** 2178    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 13:01:13  
**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:** 2179    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 13:01:13  
**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:** 2180    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 13:01:21  
**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:** 2181    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 13:01:22  
**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:** 2182    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 13:01:43  
**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:** 2183    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 13:01:48  
**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:** 2184    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 13:02:02  
**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:** 2185    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 13:02:21  
**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:** 2186    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 13:02:34  
**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:** 2187    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 13:02:47  
**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:** 2188    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 13:02:53  
**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:** 2189    **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.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2190    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 13:03:01  
**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:** 2191    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 13:03:01  
**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:** 2192    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 13:03:07  
**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:** 2193    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 13:03:13  
**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:** 2194    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 13:03:18  
**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:** 2195    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 13:03:29  
**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.  
I look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2196    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 13:03:51  
**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:** 2197    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 13:03:57  
**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:** 2198    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 13:30:19  
**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:** 2199    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 13:30:19  
**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:** 2200    **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.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts 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 would be heart breaking to see such beautiful creatures disappear, & become extinct. Please protect these precious, innocent, creatures from an uncertain fate. Such beauty, & innocence must always have a safe haven here on our beautiful planet.

Thank you.

Sincerely, Ruth M. Leibowitz New Jersey

**Correspondence ID:** 2201    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,30,2010 13:30:29

**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:** 2202    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,30,2010 13:30:29  
**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:** 2203    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** blum, joseph  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 13:30:36  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:**

Although I still have hopes of being able to retire to my home here on the Outer Banks one day, I feel the recent actions involving NPS, Audubon, the Consent Decree and now the DEIS render those hopes uncertain as to exactly what that retirement will be like. I had anticipated the recreational paradise with open beaches that I had encountered when I decided to purchase property here. This Spring, as has been the case for the last several April/May periods, these beaches have been arbitrarily closed to me as I just experienced this past Wednesday for example the Hook area with 45 open only as a cul-de-sac for .3 miles and the approach from 49 roped off. Since the water on the northern beaches was still too cold, I was left with fishing a completely flattened section off 49 with no drop-offs or holes to speak of. Granted the only importance to me was my day off for fishing. I did not stand to lose income or a job over my loss but my frustrations of that afternoon certainly raises the specter of losing my retirement to a mindset that has dreamed up Alternative F with 1000 meter buffers, no corridor bypasses, and treating non-endangered species as if they were officially endangered. I have been following these events now ever since the Consent Decree and recently attended the DEIS comment meeting this past Monday at the High School where I heard many well-spoken local folks with much more to lose than myself express their dismay over a proposal which would be more restrictive than the already unacceptable NPS bias against ORV access. That bias certainly has harmed, and if made permanent, will further damage the local economy. Without question, the elderly and the disabled will have been prevented from beach access. It appears to me that NPS has lost its way. This area was promised to be a recreational area for people to enjoy yet NPS seems determined to create another wildlife refuge. Please reconsider your priorities in these matters. I believe the position paper published by the Coalition for Beach Access is far superior to Alternative F, and if implemented, should allow co-existence for all parties in this matter, including the Plover. Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2204    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 13:31:16  
**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:** 2205    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 13:31:17  
**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:** 2206    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr.30,2010 13:31:24

**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:** 2207    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr.30,2010 13:32:04

**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:** 2208    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr.30,2010 13:32:04

**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:** 2209    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.30,2010 13:32:04

**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:** 2210    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.30,2010 13:32:10

**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:** 2211    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.30,2010 13:32:16

**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:** 2212    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.30,2010 13:32:22

**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:** 2213    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.30,2010 13:32:47

**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:** 2214    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.30,2010 13:32:53

**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:** 2215    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr.30,2010 13:32:53

**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:** 2216    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr.30,2010 13:33:05

**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:** 2217    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr.30,2010 13:33:17

**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:** 2218    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr.30,2010 13:33:43

**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:** 2219    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr.30,2010 13:33:51

**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:** 2220    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr.30,2010 13:34:10

**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.

0009418

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

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

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

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2221    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.30,2010 14:00:34

**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.

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

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

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

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2222    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.30,2010 14:00:35

**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:** 2223    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.30,2010 14:00:35

**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:** 2224    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,30,2010 14:00:38

**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:** 2225    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,30,2010 14:00:38

**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:** 2226    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,30,2010 14:00:50

**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:** 2227    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,30,2010 14:00:50

**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:** 2228    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,30,2010 14:00:51

**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:** 2229    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,30,2010 14:01:00

**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:** 2230    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,30,2010 14:01:00

**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:** 2231    **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.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts 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 seen what unregulated ATV/ORV management can do to a park. I no longer can visit a park in my town due to damage caused by irresponsible riders and lax enforcement. It's not a big area, but I did like to take my dog their for walks. And now it is full of muddy ruts from ATV usage and often is polluted by the smell of gasoline. A small group of pleasure seekers should not decide the fate of such an area, I encourage you to enact measures to ensure the protection of local wildlife, so that future generations my enjoy the area responsibly.

**Correspondence ID:** 2232    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,30,2010 14:01:33

**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:** 2233    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 14:01:33  
**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:** 2234    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 14:01:33  
**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:** 2235    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 14:16:42  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Of the 45 people providing comments at the public hearing held in Hampton Va. last night, only two supported beach closure. One of those,suggested she supported beach closures so that she would be able to see the birds and turtles for years? I'm not sure she understood what a beach closure means.

The other had spent much of his life researching the Piping Plover but still offered no scientific data as to how the presence of humans endangered the Plover. The biggest danger to the birds and turtles appears to be ocean overwash and natural predators, not people.

My family and friends have been regular visitors to Cape Hatteras for the last 35 years. Hatteras is the place we go to surf, fish, enjoy the beach and escape the city. When we leave, we leave the beach just as we found it. This is place my children have learned to appreciate nature and protect the environment.

My interest aside, an economy and more importantly a culture should not be destroyed by the NPS at the request of few high powered, big business special interest groups. The coastline and national parks of the United States belongs to it's citizens. It's the National Park Services responsibility to protect our parks so that we may enjoy them, not deny us access to them. I support full beach access.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2236    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 14:30:53  
**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:** 2237    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 14:31:08  
**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:** 2238    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 14:31:08  
**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 very much for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2239    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 14:31:12  
**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.  
PLEASE PROTECT CAPE HATTERAS NOW. THANK YOU.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2240    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 14:31:15  
**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.  
I would like to enjoy the beauty of this area, but since I would be on foot, this area is not for me unless I have rights at least equal to those with vehicles. We need to do all we can to protect endangered species: this does NOT include ORV's.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2241    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 14:31:21  
**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.  
I like to walk the beaches and do not want the noise or gasoline pollution on the beach that ORV would cause.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a

chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

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

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2242    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 14:31:31  
**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:** 2243    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 14:31:31  
**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:** 2244    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 14:31:35  
**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:** 2245    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 14:31:37  
**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:** 2246    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 14:54:15  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am concerned that all of the aspects of this issue(Hatteras access/impact on wildlife) aren't being addressed. As a life long vacationer to the area, this would drastically impact my ability and cost to visit the area, as the changes being made would limit access. I want to be able to raise my kids to visit the OBX and enjoy the area, as well as open a business in the area, both of which I may not do if this passes. I respect the protection of this area, but I don't think it should come at the cost of the people who live and love the area.

**Correspondence ID:** 2247    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 15:01:25  
**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:** 2248    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 15:01:25  
**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:** 2249    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,30,2010 15:01:25

**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:** 2250    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,30,2010 15:01:29

**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:** 2251    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,30,2010 15:01:30

**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:** 2252    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,30,2010 15:01:36

**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:** 2253    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,30,2010 15:01:36

**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:** 2254    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,30,2010 15:01:44

**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:** 2255    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,30,2010 15:01:45

**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:** 2256    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,30,2010 15:01:51

**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:** 2257    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,30,2010 15:02:03

**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:** 2258    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,30,2010 15:02:03

**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:** 2259    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,30,2010 15:02:15

**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:** 2260    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,30,2010 15:02:21

**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:** 2261    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,30,2010 15:02:27

**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:** 2262    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,30,2010 15:02:33

**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:** 2263    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,30,2010 15:02:33

**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:** 2264    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Rudar, Paul R

**Received:** Apr,30,2010 15:04:12

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Hi! My name is Paul Rudar I am A self taught naturalist.I am 56 years old.I have spent most of my off time studying Animals birds,and fish, of all sorts.I have traveled from northern Canada to southern Florida doing this.I have spent countless hours at the OBX of NC.Since my youth I have seen too many cases of habitat destruction to valuable lands used by wildlife and fish.I was always amazed how the birds adapted to ORV use at the Cape Hatteras Recreational Seashore.Even more amazing was how habitat was created for the birds on the dredge islands.They prosper there with very little predation.In short what I am trying to tell you there is no sound science that over the years ORV use caused harm to any of the native nesting birds there.The interim MGT. plan was a good one and should be reinstated.My opinion is there are no good options in the DEIS NONE.The NPS is being bullied by A very small group SELC, DOW, and Audubon.Which in reality could care less about birds or the people of Hatteras island.They do nothing to suggest alternate ways to create habitat.They spend no funds on habitat for anything anywhere.They make there money in the courts and that is the bottom line of this entire problem.The NPS is also in my opinion obligated to manage Cape Hatteras recreation area as the majority of the people want not the suing few.Please reinstate the interim management plan because it worked for many years.Also please consider the loss of money spent for the local population to prosper. Since the consent decree My family has not spent much time enjoying our favorite seashore.Thank You! God Bless You Paul R. Rudar

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2265    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,30,2010 15:31:27

**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:** 2266    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,30,2010 15:31:32

**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:** 2267    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 15:31:40  
**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:** 2268    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 15:31:47  
**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:** 2269    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 15:31:54  
**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:** 2270    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.30,2010 15:32:05  
**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:** 2271    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.30,2010 15:32:12  
**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:** 2272    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.30,2010 15:32:18  
**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:** 2273    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 15:32:23  
**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:** 2274    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 15:50:37  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please do not close the beaches to Off Road Vehicles. I love going down to The Outer Banks for the reason, that I can drive right up to the beach and enjoy having my vehicles amenities right next to me. I can appreciate the interest in preserving the wildlife, but I do believe that it can be accomplished without having to close the beaches to Off Road Vehicles. Thank you  
J.A.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2275    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 16:01:42  
**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:** 2276    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 16:02:09  
**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:** 2277    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 16:02:34  
**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:** 2278    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 16:02:53  
**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:** 2279    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 16:02:54  
**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:** 2280    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 16:03:09  
**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:** 2281    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 16:03:43  
**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:** 2282    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 16:04:04  
**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:** 2283    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 16:04:30  
**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:** 2284    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 16:04:36  
**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:** 2285    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 16:04:36  
**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:** 2286    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 16:04:48  
**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:** 2287    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 16:05:10  
**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:** 2288    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 16:05:20  
**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:** 2289    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 16:05:24  
**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:** 2290    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 16:05:48  
**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:** 2291    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 16:07:39  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I've been driving on the beaches of Cape Hatteras since the Hurbert Bonner bridge was built. Over the years I've seen more and more restrictions placed on people's use of the beach. Some of these are needed but many are not. Most of the pressure now being put on the NPS to future restrict the use of the

beaches is by outside influence who know nothing of the actual goings on at Hatteras. They have their own agenda and it has nothing to do with real facts and life on the Outer Banks. Let the local people decide what is best for THIER ISLAND and way of life. The respect the land/sea and would do nothing to harm either. thanks, Dick Gray

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2292    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 16:30:51  
**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:** 2293    **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 have the good fortune to live very near several National Monuments as well as one of the jewels in the crown of the NPS system - the Gran Canyon. Maintaining a healthy environment for all visitors as well as the flora and fauna is extremely important to me.  
I would therefore like to record my support the "environmentally preferred" Alternative D for the Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Watching the looming devastation of so many other coastal regions of our nation right now has broken my heart and makes me fear for the future. The birds, turtles, and other animals that rely on our fragile coastal systems need to be protected from uses that endanger them. As someone who uses the NPS a great deal, I believe that Alternative D will afford them that protection as well as make the area even more enjoyable and accessible to the maximum number of citizens and visitors.  
Thank you for this opportunity to comment.  
Regards

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2294    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 16:31:02  
**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:** 2295    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 16:31:31  
**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:** 2296    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 16:31:32  
**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:** 2297    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 16:32:04  
**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:** 2298    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 16:32:11  
**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:** 2299    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 16:32:14  
**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:** 2300    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 16:32:28  
**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:** 2301    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 16:32:39  
**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:** 2302    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,30,2010 16:33:02

**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:** 2303    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,30,2010 16:33:03

**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:** 2304    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,30,2010 16:33:03

**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:** 2305    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,30,2010 16:33:03

**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:** 2306    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,30,2010 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:** 2307    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,30,2010 16:33:25

**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:** 2308    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,30,2010 16:33:47

**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:** 2309    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,30,2010 16:33:47

**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:** 2310    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,30,2010 17:01:29

**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.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2311	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Apr,30,2010 17:01:58						
<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>Cape Hatteras is a very special place to me. I enjoy kite surfing there every spring and I definitely think the beach should be foot access only. It should be this way for the naturalists at heart, those who support silent sports and healthy physical activity.</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>	2312	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Apr,30,2010 17:02:00						
<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. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families 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>	2313	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Apr,30,2010 17:02:08						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						

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

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

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

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2314    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 17:02:15  
**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:** 2315    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 17:02:20  
**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:** 2316    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 17:02:23  
**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:** 2317    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 17:02:26  
**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:** 2318    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 17:02:26  
**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:** 2319    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 17:02:26  
**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:** 2320    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,30,2010 17:02:33

**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:** 2321    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,30,2010 17:02:33

**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:** 2322    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,30,2010 17:02:38

**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.

Surely we must be able to accommodate species other than the human. After all, even if we consider only our own species' welfare, without our fellow beings, the human experience would be far, far poorer.

Please do all possible to limit, even forbid, all ORV uses of beaches & other wildlife habitats.

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

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2323    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,30,2010 17:02:39

**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:** 2324    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,30,2010 17:02:45

**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:** 2325    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,30,2010 17:02:45

**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:** 2326    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,30,2010 17:31:15

**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:** 2327    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,30,2010 17:31:22

**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:** 2328    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,30,2010 17:31:43

**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:** 2329    **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.

\* Put Natural 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. A plan must include clear goals and milestones 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:** 2330    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,30,2010 17:32:02

**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:** 2331    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,30,2010 17:32:03

**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:** 2332    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 17:32:19  
**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:** 2333    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 17:32:19  
**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:** 2334    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 17:32:19  
**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:** 2335    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 17:32:20  
**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:** 2336    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 17:33:03  
**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.  
Let Wildlife Live Wild!  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 2337    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 18:01:17  
**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:** 2338    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,30,2010 18:01:28

**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.

The wild areas of our country should remain intact as much as possible! This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

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

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

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

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

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

**Correspondence ID:** 2339    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,30,2010 18:01:32

**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:** 2340    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,30,2010 18:01:35

**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:** 2341    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 18:01:39  
**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.  
 Saving these animals is very 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:** 2342    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 18:01:54  
**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:** 2343    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 18:02:10  
**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:** 2344    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr.30,2010 18:02:13

**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:** 2345    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr.30,2010 18:02:20

**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:** 2346    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr.30,2010 18:02:28

**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:** 2347    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.30,2010 18:02:28

**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:** 2348    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.30,2010 18:02:29

**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:** 2349    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.30,2010 18:02:29

**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:** 2350    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 18:02:32  
**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:** 2351    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 18:03:06  
**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:** 2352    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 18:08:04  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Cape Hatteras is one of the most famous kitesurfing spot in the world and closing access to the beach would be detrimental to tourism and the many business in the area that offer water sports.

**Correspondence ID:** 2353    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,30,2010 18:31:08  
**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:** 2354    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 18:31:08  
**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:** 2355    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 18:31:08  
**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:** 2356    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,30,2010 18:31:15  
**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:** 2357    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 18:31:21  
**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:** 2358    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 18:32:22  
**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 topic is very important to us.  
 This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
 The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
 \*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
 \* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
 \* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2359    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 18:32:32  
**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:** 2360    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 18:32:38  
**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:** 2361    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 18:32:41  
**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:** 2362    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 18:32:54  
**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:** 2363    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 19:01:07  
**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:** 2364    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 19:01:18  
**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:** 2365    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 19:01:23  
**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:** 2366    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 19:01:26  
**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:** 2367    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 19:01:34  
**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. Disturbance is the big reason for stopping these recreation vehicles. They are obnoxious.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2368    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 19:01:35  
**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:** 2369    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 19:01:38  
**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.  
YOur truly,

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2370    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 19:01:45  
**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:** 2371    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 19:02:17  
**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:** 2372    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Williams, Craig K  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 19:24:44  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** To Whom It May Concern-  
I've been going to the Outer Banks for the past 35+ years, ever since my Grandfather purchased one of the first properties in Brigands Bay (Frisco). One of the great joys we always had was driving on the beach to go fishing. I loved it so much that I bought my own place there 3 years ago, only 2 streets over from his. Since then, I've taken my young family on the beach many times. We love doing exactly what I've done for 30+ years and I had hoped of passing along the great times I've learned to my children. It's been wonderful.  
But now that's changing... The idea of regulating ORVs on the beach is mysterious to me. It can only come from people who haven't been to the OBX and simply don't understand the history of generations that have lived and visited for this very right. We all love nature and intend to protect wildlife but to restrict ORV's like those that are proposed makes no sense to me. Personally, if I didn't care so much about wildlife, I would most likely be vacationing somewhere other than the OBX each year.  
In fact, the Bonner Bridge has taken forever to build because of all the bickering about wildlife protection. The bridge is so bad that I'm now feeling at risk every time I take my family across it. We joke about holding our breath as we travel over it and then I look down to see hardly any ORVs below. Nobody is fishing, nobody is hanging out enjoying nature. All I see are white picket signs everywhere- those that say you can't drive. It's a double reminder of how uninformed special interest groups can ruin so many good things in life.  
So.....I've decided to sell the cottage I love this Summer. While I love going to the OBX, it's not what I know anymore. Yes, I can still enjoy the beach but I can't drive where I want, I can't take my family out to a secluded area, I can't get away like I used to. It's not the same.  
Again, to special interest groups who don't vacation there...you'll have no idea what impacts you're having to the local economy and to those who have been diehard fans of the OBX.  
I'M ABSOLUTELY POSITIVE YOU WON'T LISTEN TO A THING I'VE WRITTEN, BUT I FEEL LIKE I AT LEAST OWE A LETTER, A COMMENT... HENCE THE NOTE.  
Sincerely, Craig Williams, former 35+ year visitor to the OBX

**Correspondence ID:** 2373    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 19:31:21  
**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:** 2374    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 19:31:26  
**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:** 2375    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 19:31:33  
**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:** 2376    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 19:31:57  
**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.

I strongly support Alternative D with the increased pedestrian access modification. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

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

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

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

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

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

**Correspondence ID:** 2377    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 19:32:07  
**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:** 2378    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 19:32:11  
**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:** 2379    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 19:32:12  
**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:** 2380    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 19:32:13  
**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:** 2381    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 19:33:31  
**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:** 2382    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 20:01:17  
**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:** 2383    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 20:01:28  
**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:** 2384    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 20:01:31  
**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:** 2385    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 20:01:34  
**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:** 2386    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 20:31:14  
**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:** 2387    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 20:31:14  
**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:** 2388    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 20:31:15  
**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:** 2389    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 20:31:17  
**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.  
 We are stewards of this planet, and have a responsibility to protect all life within it. I enjoy few things more than seeing wildlife in their native habitat, and most Americans agree.  
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2390    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 20:31:19  
**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.  
 As a person who not only loves to walk on beaches, the main reason I do this is to watch wildlife and especially birds.  
 This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
 The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
 \*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
 \* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
 \* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2391    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 20:31:20  
**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:** 2392    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 20:31:20  
**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:** 2393    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 20:32:09  
**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:** 2394    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 20:32:14  
**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:** 2395    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 20:32:21  
**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:** 2396    **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:  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 2397    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 20:32:45  
**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:** 2398    **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 want you to help 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.

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2399    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 20:55:22  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am for ORV rights on the beach. Nick Griffin

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2400    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Griffin, houston t  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 20:58:41  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I believe in allowing off road vehicles to continue traveling on the beach inside cape hatteras national sea shore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2401    **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.

We have enough environmental disasters to worry about with the blowout in the Gulf right now. How about we get something done right and prohibit more beaches from ORVs? ORVs use gas (which is going to be in shorter supply until we cap the rig), and Americans need to get more exercise anyway.

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

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

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2402    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 21:01:12  
**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:** 2403    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 21:01:18  
**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:** 2404    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 21:01:18  
**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.  
I visited Cape Hatteras many times as a child, it was quiet and pristine. No National Seashore, from Cape cod to Georgia, should allow any machine. I had no idea that off road vehicles were even allowed. Some people care nothing for others or the planet . Please manage ORV off public land.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2405    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 21:01:19  
**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:** 2406    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 21:01:36  
**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:** 2407    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 21:02:02  
**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:** 2408    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 21:02:02  
**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:** 2409    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 21:02:04  
**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:** 2410    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 21:02:22  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I believe ORVs should be allowed to use the beach inside cape hatteras national sea shore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2411    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 21:31:37  
**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:** 2412    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 21:31:39  
**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:** 2413    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 21:31:40  
**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:** 2414    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,30,2010 21:31:43

**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:** 2415    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,30,2010 21:31:44

**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:** 2416    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,30,2010 21:31:46

**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:** 2417    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,30,2010 21:31:47

**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:** 2418    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,30,2010 21:32:02

**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:** 2419    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,30,2010 21:32:08

**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:** 2420    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,30,2010 21:32:08

**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.

I consider this a priority for future generation! Please think long and hard about the consequences of our actions. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

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

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

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

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

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

**Correspondence ID:** 2421    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,30,2010 21:32:09

**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:** 2422    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Apr,30,2010 21:32:09

**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:** 2423    **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.  
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. Please protect our ever increasingly threatened habitats for endangered sea birds and turtles.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2424    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 22:02:05  
**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:** 2425    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 22:02:05  
**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:** 2426    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 22:02:07  
**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:** 2427    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 22:02:07  
**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:** 2428    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 22:02:07  
**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:** 2429    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 22:02:07  
**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:** 2430    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 22:02:12  
**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:** 2431    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Jaeger, Anna  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 22:30:55  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I think I was 10 when I first vacationed on Hatteras Island. For years, we stayed at the hotel at the Rodanthe Pier. I have amazing memories of swimming, surfing, long beach walks, and catching fish from the beach. Thirty years later, my family now has a house in Frisco that borders the Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Three generations of three different families come from as far away as Japan to do the very same thing ? swim, walk on the beaches, catch fish, enjoy all that Hatteras has to offer. My children love it as much as I did. Please consider a balanced approach to managing Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Severe pedestrian and vehicle restrictions will dramatically and negatively affect the flavor of the area.

**Correspondence ID:** 2432    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 22:31:17  
**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:** 2433    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 22:31:23  
**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:** 2434    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 22:31:24  
**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:** 2435    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 22:31:24  
**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:** 2436    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.30.2010 22:31:24  
**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:** 2437    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.30.2010 22:31:24  
**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:** 2438    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr.30.2010 23:01:27  
**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:** 2439    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 23:01:29

**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:** 2440    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 23:01:35

**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:** 2441    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 23:31:35

**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:** 2442    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 23:31:35  
**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:** 2443    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 23:31:47  
**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:** 2444    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,01,2010 00:01:52  
**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:** 2445    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,01,2010 00:01:52  
**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:** 2446    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,01,2010 00:01:52  
**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:** 2447    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,01,2010 00:31:46  
**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:** 2448    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,01,2010 00:31:46  
**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:** 2449    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,01,2010 01:01:48  
**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:** 2450    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,01,2010 01:01:48  
**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:** 2451    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,01,2010 01:31:59  
**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:** 2452    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,01,2010 02:31:58  
**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:** 2453    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,01,2010 03:31:58  
**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:** 2454    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.01,2010 04:31:58  
**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:** 2455    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Wigfield, Lucas  
**Received:** May.01,2010 04:55:57  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** To whom it may concern: It is my opinion that the beaches of the North Carolina Outer Banks be left open to vehicular access for numerous reasons. The North Carolina Beach Buggy Association has a good reputation for being good stewards of the beaches and most of us who vacation there are members. If not for open beaches to drive on, I like many others would cease going to the Outer Banks. I enjoy fishing, relaxing, and spending the time with family and friends while parked on the beach. I also pick up trash that blows by and do not harm any wildlife, except maybe a fish or two. If the beaches are closed to vehicles it will just be another thing the government will have taken away from its citizens to pander to the special interest of a select few. If you wonder why the American people are so fed up with federal government this is just another thing to consider.  
PLEASE keep the beaches open to off road vehicles to sustain your local economy and to allow the people who enjoy it to continue to have a fairly cheap pastime in this lousy economy.  
sincerely  
Lucas Wigfield

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2456    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.01,2010 05:01:59  
**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:** 2457    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.01.2010 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 grew up in Virginia and fondly remember trips to the Outer Banks. I now live in Massachusetts, and I am struck by how well Piping Plovers are doing on the Massachusetts Cape and how poorly they are recovering on the Outer Banks. One of the main reasons for the difference is the unrestricted access to the beach that ORVs have in North Carolina. To preserve the natural beauty for my children when I return to Virginia and North Carolina with my children, I would ask you to consider the following proposal.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2458    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.01.2010 05:32:49  
**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:** 2459    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.01.2010 05:32:54  
**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:** 2460    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,01,2010 05:32:59

**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:** 2461    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,01,2010 05:33:07

**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:** 2462    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,01,2010 05:33:46

**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:** 2463    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,01,2010 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.  
I have had the opportunity to see the Outer Banks seashore, it is an amazing and beautiful place and needs to be protected for future generations. Come on people-driving on the beach should be prohibited completely-it's just simply not necessary. The ignorant people who wish to continue this activity obviously have no care for anything but themselves.

**Correspondence ID:** 2464    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,01,2010 06:12:09  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am strongly opposed to the closures proposed in pages 97 -101 of the DEIS. For example my family has enjoyed the Hatteras Point for generations for such activities as fishing both commercial and recreational picnics and other family outings. Traditionally many families would load up all the kids, pack them in cars, take them to Hatteras Point where the group would catch crabs and fish and cook them on open fires, spending the whole day in a great whole sun environment. A lot of family values were taught and learned at Hatteras Inlet. Myself and many others of my generation learned to drive on the flats that were there then. Hatteras Inlet has always been a place where families could go and enjoy a nice day at the beach. There is no reason people, birds and turtles can't all enjoy the traditional uses of this area as they have for generations. Protecting the Plover nest does not demand the entire Point, Hatteras or Buxton be closed. The number Plovers killed over the years prove this. Of the 26 birds killed, 23 were by the NPS. I am also strongly opposed the restrictions proposed on page 136 of the DEIS as to animals on the beach. My wife and I walk our dogs, on leashes, on the beach, as do many other people, for exercise every day. No dog on a leashes is going to disturb any nesting bird or turtle. Much of our income comes from summer rentals and now about 30% for the cottage rentals are dog friendly. This of course means that many vacationers come with their pets to enjoy the beach. With the existing leash laws there is no problem. There is a ship wreck that is in our walk area that changes daily. Sometimes it is almost complete uncovered and a few days later all you can see are rusty iron spikes protruding out of the sand. It is amazing and wonderful to watch what nature does to our beach and this late 1800's shipwreck. This is part of our heritage and historical use of the beach with our children, our grandchildren and our pets too. It is essential this be maintained for it's traditional use now and for future generations.

**Correspondence ID:** 2465    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,01,2010 06:32:06  
**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:** 2466    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,01,2010 06:32:11  
**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:** 2467    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,01,2010 06:44:04  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please keep Cape Hatteras open to vehicular traffic. The local businesses suffer when access is cut off, as do the many vacationers that pick Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area as their destination. When the park was established did it not say that the park would be for the enjoyment of all? That should include people.. with or without vehicles. The birds can be protected without closing off mammoth portions of beach. If people just drive through and area and don't get out to scare the birds off their nests... provide a vehicle access above or below the nesting area until the chicks actually hatch. Then a closure until they fledge seems reasonable. There are rules that can be enforced to help reduce stress on the birds..... ie. dogs off leash and pedestrians in nesting areas. Foot traffic should observe the same walking area as vehicles use. You would have to have a lot of time on your hands to go through the entire book presented ... most people don't have that kind of time and just want to be able to reasonably enjoy a fishing vacation with access to follow the fish. Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2468    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,01,2010 06:54:02  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please keep access to the greatest surf recreation open and accessible

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2469    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,01,2010 07:02:07  
**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:** 2470    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,01,2010 07:02:07  
**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:** 2471    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,01,2010 07:02:07  
**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:** 2472    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Eskew, Mark  
**Received:** May,01,2010 07:12:47  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Access to public beaches should remain open. It is a simple treasure that multitudes of tax paying individuals enjoy. Keep this national treasure intact. Granted, driving a vehicle on the beach does require some "maintenance" but I feel it is well worth the expense. There is nothing like driving your children on the beach for the first time and watching their eyes open wide and their faces light up.  
Our efforts should be focused on the petroleum companies Exxon, and now BP to ensure that their off shore drilling does not destroy our beaches. We are all for protecting the birds and sea turtles and people who visit the beaches respect this important aspect. For those who do not throw them in jail and do not let them out.  
Keep them open!  
Respectfully,  
Mark T. Eskew, Owner Everest Contractors, LLC www.peacelodge.net 336-972-4270

**Correspondence ID:** 2473    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Tidd, Shelley  
**Received:** May,01,2010 07:20:11  
**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. Thank You! Shelley Tidd

**Correspondence ID:** 2474    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,01,2010 07:32:12  
**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:** 2475    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,01,2010 07:32:12

**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:** 2476    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,01,2010 07:32:12

**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:** 2477    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,01,2010 07:32:18

**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:** 2478    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Diamante, Todd A  
**Received:** May,01,2010 07:35:01  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Hello,  
I would like to comment on the DEIS, for public access to the beaches via off-road vehicles. I have been visiting Cape Hatteras for 25+ years. The main draw for me was the fishing, and the fact that we could drive our trucks on the beach, in order to get close to the surf fishing.  
I visit the island at least once or twice a year, specifically for the fishing. Ever since this planning project, and the supposed protection of the birds, the road-blocks have seriously impaired the ability to reach the "point" via truck, which as you are probably aware, is one of the best fishing spots on the East Coast.  
I am against this entire situation, and wish that this project would be dismissed. While I understand the thoughts about preserving some of these bird species, they are much more in danger of natural predators, such as the thousands of wild Cats, and other animals on the island.  
Since I have visited the Island, I have noticed that the vast vast majority of people respect the beaches, and take their time to be on the look-out for any species that may be nesting, or walking on the beach. The one (1) time I noticed someone abusing the beaches, by speeding, I immediately reported the infraction, and I am confident that any angler would do the same.  
While I do not live there, I have made several friends that own businesses on the island, and I continuously hear how this project has severely impaired their business. Especially during these trying times, we need to direct more business to the locals, and not impede their ability to make a living, pay taxes, etc.  
I among other thousands of people, would like you to please consider ending this madness immediately!  
I thank you for your time, and consideration.  
Todd Diamante

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2479    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Knowles, Jeanelle R  
**Received:** May,01,2010 07:37:55  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please do not allow a group of well-funded, well-meaning, but misguided environmental special interest groups to deny us, the American citizen and taxpayer, our right to access to our own national parks. The government should trust its citizens to protect our natural resources. The vast majority of us are excellent stewards of our national treasures and should not be denied access in order to please the few inflexible environmental groups that refuse to compromise.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2480    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,01,2010 07:48:25  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** There must be a balanced approach to the issue of beach access vs. habitat preservation. An extreme position in defense of either position does nothing but pour fuel on an already explosive topic. It appears that special interest (environmental) groups with enormous financial and political influence are holding sway at the expense of what is reasonable and just. The manner in which policies are being established and enforced causes it to appear as if there is an agenda already implemented whose goal, ( in the name of environmental preservation), is to destroy the economy and cultural heritage of Hatteras Island and families that have lived here for centuries. If this is true, may it be exposed, and all necessary adjustments and corrections occur in order for that which is 'fair and just' to prevail.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2481    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,01,2010 08:09:26  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I travel 500 miles to the Outer Banks to fish. I would like beach access at all times of the day and night with protected areas sectioned off. ORV's could drive around the protected areas and still leave beach access open at all times.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2482    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Phillips, Gail L  
**Received:** May,01,2010 08:15:28  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** To Whom It May Concern:  
I am writing this letter as a mother of 4 children that has come to the Outer Banks since I was a small child from Pennsylvania. My family and I started out by camping in a pop up trailer at the state camp grounds and ended up as we got older renting a beach house.  
I have lived on the outer banks for 3 years and am still working for a local rental agency, even with me moving away. I have seen the happy faces of so many families, including mine, that look forward to their annual, semi-annual, monthly visit to the Outer Banks. The allure of surf fishing, shelling, and

the crystal clean waters is what makes us all get thru the year round work week. The week or long weekend that gets us thru would be taken away if the access to the point and driving on the beach is taken away. I know that I would not have been able to take my children, ages 14, 11 and two that are 4, if I wasn't able to access the beach with my vehicle. The items I need to actually get there and not worry that I forgot the umbrella, sun lotion, or the cooler, that is always too heavy to carry, is just one reason of many to consider what kind of impact it would have on the average family that fishes, shells, or just enjoys walking along the beach shore holding the hand of their loved ones. I also fish so getting all the items I would need for that would be down right impossible.

On all my visits and living there, I had not seen one person disobey the ropes that are up or purposely go towards any of the birds that are on the beach. I truly think that the people realize what a gift it is to be able to access beach and respect our boundaries that are already in place. This is what I believe you all do not give us credit for.

Thank you for listening to a mom that is concerned that when she get the chance to have grandchildren, that opportunity to vacation and sit on the beach at Cape Hatteras Recreational Seashore will not be something that will continue....

Sincerely,  
Gail L. Phillips

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2483    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Hudspeth, Jeremy T  
**Received:** May,01,2010 08:21:52  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Im MAD AS HELL about this environmental empact statment It's based on LIES and JUNK SCIENCE. I remember when once the National Park Service was a friend of the people and the National park system was the greatest thing the United States Government devised. Now it would seem that you're just a stool pigeon for the radical environmental eco natzi groups who are Not interested in a fair compromise but rather a full takeover of the Park system for their own private bird santuary.This issue started ORV and has now came full circle to where people can't even set foot on their own Sea Shore And Recreational Area. "GOOD DAY"

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2484    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,01,2010 08:26:46  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** These beaches need to be protected!!! I feel it is the U.S. Dept. of Interior's job to do just that. This is a NATIONAL SEASHORE, not just a Hyde or Dare County local county beach. These beaches are to be preserved not only for the two hundred milion U.S. residents, but any legal alien of the world visiting this great nation. The 800 or so people who showed up at the recent public hearings have a right to their opinion but, I feel, are an insignificant minority when looking at the overall scope of this National Treasure. This recent phenomenon of SUV, AWD, and ORV'S needs to be put in check immediately. We know this from the occurence of over 2500 full sized vehicles on the beach on Ocracoke alone in a single day. If this trend continues, the consequence for wildlife and natural ecological beauty of this fragile ecosystem will be in jeopardy. There are approximatley 6640 miles of coast line on the mainland U.S. To preserve Cape Lookout through Cape Hatteras' 130 miles is a crucial responsibility of the Park Service. Please, I beg you to stop the driving on the beach.....NOW!!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2485    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,01,2010 08:29:19  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I have been coming to Hatteras/Ocracoke for beach fishing in the fall for many years and it is the high point of my year. For this reason, continued access to the remote parts of the beaches is very important to me.  
Due to the remote locations of the beach relative to paved roads and the many miles of beach, ORV access is essential to allow the public to access the park's beaches, this is especially true for physically challenged people, young children, and older adults  
Many environmental impact studies have been done and each and every one has shown that driving on the beach (as it has been practiced at Hatteras for over 60 years) has caused no detectable damage to the environment.  
The NPS has maintained records of turtle nesting, hatching, and incidents in which turtle hatchlings were killed since 2000. On average, there are about 12,000 hatchlings per year. In no year have more than 4 turtle hatchlings been killed by an ORV, while pedestrians have killed as many as 17 in one year. As you may know turtles produce so many hatchlings because very few survive to adulthood - the vast majority are eaten (in the first few hours of their life) by shore birds and fish before they reach the relative safety of the deep water. Since records have been kept, out of 93,500 hatchlings, ORV's have killed a total of 7, pedestrians 23 - an insignificant number relative to natural predation, certainly not enough to stop allowing ORV's (or pedestrians) on the beach.  
The NPS has been actively closing parts of the beach to ORV's and pedestrians to prevent interference with the mating and breeding of shore birds. While the effects of the closures on actual bird population are hard to determine, it is easy to recognize the effects of raccoons, stray cats, and stray dogs that have moved into the area with the presence of the human population.  
There are several barrier islands that have no bridge access and no human populations. These islands are largely free from un-natural predators. Shore birds will naturally avoid the populated islands for the safety of these islands. Encouraging the return of breeding birds to hatteras is an admirable goal, but one that is unlikely to work as long as there is a bridge to the island. I support continuation of the current system of nesting closures, combined with better control of the predator populations to increase bird breeding on the island. I would also point out that there are many hundreds of miles of beach nearby but outside of the national park where absolutely no ORV access is permitted, surely the 70 miles of beach in the park where ORV access is permitted cannot be responsible for a significant impact on bird breeding regardless of the management plan that is used.  
The new plan would eliminate all beach driving on Ocracoke island in favor of building a new road across the dunes closer to the beach to improve pedestrian access. The road construction project will create a much larger impact on the environment than the current ORV access on the beach. The road will impact the fragile dune environment and its vegetation and animal population instead of the stable and relatively barren beach zone. Birds crossing the new road are likely to be hit by vehicles traveling at a significant speed. Speed control on the new road will require constant and active enforcement, requiring the hiring of officers to enforce it. The sand provides constant passive speed control at no cost to the taxpayer - you just can't drive fast on sand even if you want to.  
It is my opinion the most logical solution to managing ORV access is to make the current management system permanent. This has the lowest environmental impact, lowest cost, and by far the widest public support.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2486    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,01,2010 08:32:19  
**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:** 2487    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,01,2010 08:32:26

**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:** 2488    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,01,2010 08:32:26

**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:** 2489    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,01,2010 08:32:26

**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:** 2490    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,01,2010 08:32:31

**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:** 2491    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,01,2010 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 have noticed that ORV's and nature don't seem to mix well, and as our natural places disappear this type of activity becomes less and less viable.

Please support Alternative D when deciding which NPS plan will be used to manage ORV use at Cap Hatteras.

The following principles 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 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:** 2492    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,01,2010 08:32:38

**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.

Our National Parks do not belong to any small group of individuals, but rather to all of us and future generations too. These wild places need our collective protection to ensure they will exist for all generations to come. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

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

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

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2493    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Johnston, James C  
**Received:** May.01.2010 08:45:40  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I feel that your policy of removing certain mammals (dead or alive) from the park to protect birds is a blatant double standard. The area around the pond near Cape Point should be removed of vegetation to give the birds room to nest and move around. This would help them and give them an area away from the beach to do their activities.  
 A parking lot nearby ramp 44 should be constructed along with some observation towers so the bird lovers could access and observe easier from an elevated platform for better vision.  
 A tractor and a cutharrow could do this job easily and economically.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2494    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.01.2010 09:02:32  
**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:** 2495    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.01.2010 09:02:32  
**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:** 2496    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.01.2010 09:02:43  
**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:** 2497    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,01,2010 09:02:53

**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:** 2498    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,01,2010 09:02:54

**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. In addition, ORV pollute, are noisy, and have plenty of other places to go. Please protect this fragile habitat so our children and grandchildren can enjoy it without the negative impacts of ORVs.

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

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

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

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2499    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,01,2010 09:03:02

**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:** 2500    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,01,2010 09:03:02  
**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:** 2501    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,01,2010 09:04:36  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** ORV IN NORTH CAROLINA IS A WAY OF LIFE FOR MANY/ ALL THINGS NEED PROTECTING INCLUDING THE RIGHTS OF THE MANY WHO ENJOY THIS PRIVILEGE.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2502    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,01,2010 09:10:54  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** it is vital to the businesses as well as fisherman to keep the seashore open to driving. these parks were intended for the use of the average citizen not the rich the poor but everyone particularly avg.joe that cant fly off to aruba or go to the compound for the weekend so we find a place we love and something we love to do there and embrace it there seems to be more and more need to constantly debate to protect our use of our park.. also as we have seen in the past no compromise is enough the minute you give up amile of territory the opponent sees fit to desire another those of us who will really be affected the most are generally the ones who truly appreciate the natural beauty of our parks and wildlife

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2503    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,01,2010 09:32:25  
**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:** 2504    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,01,2010 09:32:25  
**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:** 2505    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,01,2010 09:32:26  
**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:** 2506    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,01,2010 09:32:32  
**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:** 2507    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,01,2010 09:32:32  
**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:** 2508    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,01,2010 09:32:32  
**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:** 2509    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Westervelt, Frederic B  
**Received:** May,01,2010 09:39:20  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** The third paragraph of the DEIS Section "Socioeconomic Impact", page 561, reads as follows:  
"The total impact of the proposed alternatives would depend on the response of the affected individuals and businesses to the changes brought about by the proposed rule. To the extent that local businesses can provide alternate products and services, they may be able to reduce the impact on their profits. In addition, the effect of the alternatives would depend on the willingness and ability of individuals to visit substitute sites for recreation and of businesses to adapt to the available opportunities and changes in visitor use patterns under whatever alternative is selected. If individuals visit other sites outside the Seashore, then these regions would experience an increase in business while businesses in the ROI would experience a decrease."  
This haughty, imperious and diffident attitude of NPS toward the travails of Outer Banks residents and businesses is not merely unbecoming, it is offensive. From our perspective this paragraph should read:  
"The total impact of the proposed alternatives would depend on the response of the affected birds and turtles to the changes brought about by the proposed rule. To the extent that local wildlife can find alternative breeding, nesting and hatching grounds, they may be able to reduce the impact on their survival (cf. Darwin, Charles: On the Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection or The Preservation of Favoured Races in the Struggle for Life, 1859). In addition, the effect of the alternatives would depend on the willingness and ability of the individuals to visit substitute sites for their biologic needs and of the species to adapt to the available opportunities and changes in hospitable habitat under whichever alternative is selected. If individuals visit other sites outside the Seashore, then these regions would experience an increase in population while the population in the ROI would

experience a decrease (Darwin: op. cit.)."

This is, indeed, what appears to be occurring. As depicted in Table 14, page 186, plovers are flourishing in Maryland, Virginia and North Carolina generally, whereas in CAHA (Fig. 3, page 187) the population is stable and near-negligible. Were Pea Island and the several spoil islands included in the census this point might well be more conspicuous.

In conclusion, I maintain that people are more important than birds, especially when the birds, being more mobile, are doing quite well.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2510    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,01,2010 10:02:31  
**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:** 2511    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,01,2010 10:02:37  
**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:** 2512    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,01,2010 10:02:38  
**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:** 2513    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,01,2010 10:02:38  
**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:** 2514    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,01,2010 10:02:38  
**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:** 2515    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Wasson, Robert L  
**Received:** May,01,2010 10:03:54  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I have loved the Outer Banks of North Carolina since my first visit there in 1968. In the past, I have visited all of the towns from Duck southward to Ocracoke, rented properties there, fished, flown kites, visited people, chartered boats, and generally learned about the islands and their people. It is a unique place. However, the Consent Decree has changed the area markedly. The Park Service seems to overlook the heritage of the people who live and work there, as well as it's own promises to those people when it presents plans such as "F" for the long term. It is much too restrictive. Others have listed, in great detail, just why. I agree with them completely.  
I once got onto the beach at Ocracoke with my old Jeep Gladiator, stuffed it into second gear, and let it idle from the south point all the way to the ferry with the wind blowing through the open windows, the sound of the waves crashing onto the shore, and the smell of the clean salt air in my nose. I took the ferry over to Hatteras, got back onto the beach, and repeated the process all the way to Manteo. I think I had to get off the beach for short distances only three times during the trip. I will fondly remember that experience for the rest of my life. However, it cannot be repeated. Too many restrictions. I have not been back to the area since the Consent Decree went into effect. As a form of protest, I will not go back until restrictions are eased, if not lifted. I used to spend several thousands of dollars there every year. There are many people like me, who will not return until the Park Service recognizes that the word "Recreational" is the key word in the Cape Hatteras National Recreational Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2516    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,01,2010 10:32:34  
**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:** 2517    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,01,2010 10:32:34

**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:** 2518    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,01,2010 10:32:41

**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:** 2519    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,01,2010 10:32:55

**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:** 2520    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,01,2010 10:32:55

**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:** 2521    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,01,2010 10:32:55

**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:** 2522    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Worgul, Jeanne

**Received:** May,01,2010 10:42:23

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am a property owner in Avon, NC 4 Wahoo Cr. have read the propopsed text. I amsurprised that it is based on flawed science and incorrect of incomplete data. Why human interventive protective actions are allowed in one instance and denied in another is baffeling? Why data on beach use in the norther shores is included in data on Hatteras island is a clear distortion. Why the economic impact on traditional villages life is so minimized is frightening. Thbe study and proposal and not scientific and need further expansion and review.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2523    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,01,2010 11:02:51  
**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:** 2524    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,01,2010 11:02:51  
**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:** 2525    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,01,2010 11:02:51  
**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:** 2526    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.01.2010 11:02:52  
**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:** 2527    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.01.2010 11:02:55  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As an annual visitor to Hatteras, I would like to express my opposition to the further restriction of beach access. Each year my extended family drive over 10 hours to vacation in Hatteras. Hatteras beaches are so family oriented and are a HUGE draw for tourism. The local economy depends on tourism for its very survival! Each year we [tourists] pump our dollars into the local economy as we patronize local businesses. We rent homes and kayaks, take deep-sea fishing trips, shop in local mom and pop grocery stores, buy souvenirs from a variety of shops, dine in local restaurants, and buy seafood from local fishermen. We enjoy visits to local museums and other venues. We LOVE, LOVE, LOVE Hatteras!  
One of the main reasons we love Hatteras is the fact that we can drive to find a secluded spot on the beach to enjoy the sand and surf. We are ALWAYS respectful of the environment and avoid areas where birds are nesting or where turtle nests exist. We ALWAYS pack out what we packed in and don't engage in wreckless behavior.  
All of that would change for us if access to the beach areas is restricted. The atmosphere of our beloved fishing village of Hatteras would change forever. The characteristics that make it unique and separate it from other beach towns up and down the Eastern coast would be lost. We live less than a 6 hour drive to many other beach towns, but choose to make the 10 hour plus drive to Hatteras so that we can enjoy Hatteras beaches. Please don't allow that to be taken away from us.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2528    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.01.2010 11:02:57  
**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:** 2529    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.01.2010 11:03:00  
**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:** 2530    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,01,2010 11:03:14

**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:** 2531    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,01,2010 11:03:14

**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:** 2532    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,01,2010 11:11:13

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Hi Our families have been vacationing in Avon, Frisco and Hatteras though out the years. We especially enjoy the beach access in Hatteras, where we

enjoy a lazy day surf fishing and relaxing. Here in NJ vehicle beach access is limited year round do to the summer beach goers, with few exceptions like Island Beach State Park (south end) all year. We have lived here for over thirty years and we have never heard of any environmental issues concerning vehicle beach access. We stay off the dunes and do not disturb the environment. We also take out our own garbage. Our beaches a clean. The wildlife is flourishing, nesting sites are marked and respected. There is no need to close beach access anywhere. OBX doesn't come near of the population of beach goers that visit NJ beaches in the summer. The people that visit your beaches are educated have a good understanding, concerns on environmental issues. People just don't drive on beaches because they can. These people are fishermen, birdwatchers, beachcombers, outdoors people, etc. They enjoy the outdoors. Wildlife has existed with mankind from the beginning. God gave us all things to enjoy. Why would you take that away.  
Joe Klingner Forked River, NJ

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2533	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	
<b>Name:</b>	Shouse, George A					
<b>Received:</b>	May,01,2010 11:13:09					
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I have been coming to the outer banks of NC for 35 years, mostly to fish. Usually go about 4 times a year. I am absolutely in favor in the continued availability of using an Off Road Vehicle to get about on the beach.					
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2534	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b> Y
<b>Name:</b>	private					
<b>Received:</b>	May,01,2010 11:23:29					
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Most of us only get to use the "Park" a few days a year and the "rules" are made by folks who don't even live in N.C. Please, open up the beaches, all of them. Those birds thriving on the spoil islands and that can be proven, just go and look. The fisherman is a friend of the Park and it's creatures and we have for years, taken care of them. Keep it that way, NO MORE CLOSURES. KEEP THE BEACHES OPEN. Thank you for taking the time to read my comment. Ron Melton Winston Salem, NC					
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2535	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b> Y
<b>Name:</b>	private					
<b>Received:</b>	May,01,2010 11:32:43					
<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>					
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2536	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b> Y
<b>Name:</b>	private					
<b>Received:</b>	May,01,2010 11:32:48					
<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>					
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2537	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b> Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.01.2010 11:32:56  
**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:** 2538    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Riggins, Julie S  
**Received:** May.01.2010 11:43:47  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please continue to allow ORVs on Hatteras Island. We love to fish there every year. We keep it clean and we respect the beach and its wildlife. Please don't take this access away.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2539    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.01.2010 12:02:45  
**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:** 2540    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.01.2010 12:02:46  
**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:** 2541    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,01,2010 12:02:46  
**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:** 2542    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,01,2010 12:02:56  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As a native North Carolinian and Hatteras Island resident for the past 10 years, I am constantly amazed by others that do not live here or visit here that have such power over individuals and their ability to live a quiet life. My husband and I both work. We pay our taxes and our bills on time. We are not free loaders of the system and we just want the ability to live our lives, enjoy the beach, fish occasionally and let our dogs play. We do not bother others. We do not bother other wildlife. But it seems there are others in the world that have it out for us and the other residence of Hatteras Island. From the inability to get a very dangerous bridge replaced to not allowing beaches to be visited, more and more it appears there is a larger plan to shut this island down. I am not sure why or who but this island cannot continue to remain with the onslaught of these individuals or businesses. It is with great emotion that I plea to everyone, we are people too. We deserve what we have worked very hard to obtain. We do not bother anyone else. We only ask that we be left to live our lives, love our beaches and enjoy the beauty that is Hatteras Island.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2543    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,01,2010 12:02:59  
**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:** 2544    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,01,2010 12:28:36  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Mike Murray, My husband and I have lived in Buxton for 36 years. We grow a garden, and have fed ourselves with the fish we catch. It is not possible to catch fish just anywhere, and The Point is our main fishing grounds. I disagree with the need for 1000 meter buffer around a plover nest. This makes it impossible to use even a narrow corridor to get to The Point. I think there is an easy solution to protecting the birds and allowing access, as the corridor we would be driving through is not suitable for the birds to be nesting on.

**Correspondence ID:** 2545    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Westervelt, Frederic B  
**Received:** May,01,2010 12:29:49  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As I waded through the bulky information on the DEIS, it gradually dawned upon me that there was a fundamental flaw in the conventional thinking regarding beach access and usage within CAHA- which is that one size must fit all. I believe that we must not look upon our beaches as a Procrustean bed, forcing all to accommodate.  
Since formulating my letter of 18 April I have struggled with the utility (or lack thereof) of Alternative F, the choice of the NPS. As noted, I still find it arcane, fractious and overly complicated, possibly unenforceable at reasonable cost and unsatisfactory to the public.  
On the other hand, it may be that Alternative F will be necessary in such heavily populated areas as Hatteras Island and adjacent Nags Head, with its beach villages, popularity for surfing and the Cape Point lighthouse attraction.  
Ocracoke, meanwhile, is unburdened by beach villages, an ample beach to person ratio and relatively low wildlife concentration.  
In my opinion, this favors Alternative A as the most appropriate choice for Ocracoke Island. This plan is administratively simple to oversee and for public cooperation, and meets the needs of wildlife conservation.  
Please give serious consideration to this tailored approach to the issue of beach access- Alternative A for Ocracoke.

**Correspondence ID:** 2546    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,01,2010 12:32:47  
**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:** 2547    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,01,2010 12:32:47  
**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:** 2548    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,01,2010 12:32:47  
**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:** 2549    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.01.2010 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.  
Below is a form letter, although I'm sure you get plenty of these please consider the below ideas as my own.  
We need to do more to protect these critical nesting areas for birds. I have been on many beaches and seen first hand the destruction that cards, bikes, and other ORV's can have on shoreline habitat.  
Although any human use will have some impact on the shoreline nesting bird species, pedestrian use and properly marked walking areas or man made paths would help to reduce the impact on the sandline/grass areas that these birds require.  
Please consider the following recommendations as my own.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2550    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.01.2010 12:32:54  
**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:** 2551    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.01.2010 12:32:54  
**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:** 2552    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,01,2010 12:32:55

**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:** 2553    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** N/A, Sue S

**Received:** May,01,2010 12:36:30

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I first visited Cape Hatteras when I was in college and fell in love with the beautiful beaches & friendly people. I longed to return and finally did with my family. We have been staying in Avon for many years and absolutely LOVE it. We enjoy driving out and spending our day at Cape Hatteras Point. The beauty, peace, friendly people, quiet, and unspoiled beaches are what we go for. Being able to drive out to the beach is what makes our vacation so very special. I have always seen everyone take their trash with them and are respectful of the beach and wildlife. We have rarely seen anything left behind. If we do we pick it up ourselves. I've seen more trash and burned firewood on the beaches we can walk to from our rental home. Being able to drive out to the beach and sit all day is pure delight and should remain that way for generations to come. That's what makes Hatteras so VERY special.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2554    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Shouse, Robert

**Received:** May,01,2010 12:37:58

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am in favor of the continued use of Off Road vehicles on the Hatteras beaches.

It's our state and as a resident, I wish to enjoy the freedom of enjoying this natural wonder, and enlightening our children to the 'Special Nature' of this piece of Earth and its perservation as a such.

Robert Richard Shouse 5/1/2010

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2555    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,01,2010 12:48:15

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** God put the beaches on the earth for humans. We get #1 priority. Birds need consideration but only after the people. It is crazy to think we have to tiptoe around the birds. We are the important beings on this earth. It is bad enough that you need a liscense to fish the ocean, now we won't be able to look at it. Are the birds going to bring in revenue for North Carolina, I doubt it. God created the earth and sky, then the animals and finally man, to enjoy his work.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2556    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,01,2010 12:55:36  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** My family has been going to the Outer Banks for more then 40 years, I took my first steps on Cape Point 37 years ago and was fortunate enough to let my son do the same 7 years ago. Fisherman have made Cape Hatteras what it is today and without them it will fade away to nothing. Every business and every resident lively hood depends on beaches being open for people like us to come to. When the land was turned over the National Park Service it was promised that the beaches would always be, but you have broken that promise. Over the last few years you have failed to remember who you work for and serve, it's not the Special Interest Groups, it's the tax payers. From all the DEIS meeting that as occurred over the last few weeks 3/4 of the majority was Fisherman. Where was the ones wanting the beaches closed, where was the great multitude of environmentalist. Their was none! If they do not care enough about voicing there opinions on what they want, then why do you continue to favor them. Well the majority has spoke and you can't hide or cover your ears from what we have said, we want our beach back. The fishing community is the real environmentalist of Cape Hatteras. We all have provided you with excellent input on what it would take to preserve this special place and you have failed to listen to any of it. It's a shame that you have turned you turned your back on a community that has supported NPS all these years.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2557    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,01,2010 13:02:48  
**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 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:** 2558    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,01,2010 13:02:48  
**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 because I am a Birder.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2559    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,01,2010 13:02:48  
**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 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:** 2560    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,01,2010 13:02:54

**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:** 2561    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,01,2010 13:02:54

**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:** 2562    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,01,2010 13:12:02

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please allow future generations of families to experience the beauty of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore just as my family has done every year, for 20 years now. Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2563    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Hudspeth, Zachary T

**Received:** May,01,2010 13:27:47

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** : When Congress established Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area in 1937, its intent was to permanently provide for all Americans a unique area for their enjoyment and use.

For years now, those of us who utilize this unique resource have been under assault by a variety of environmental special interest groups that would deny us, but not themselves, access. And, in each case where evidence was heard from both sides in the court, they were sent packing. Quite simply, their claims were refuted by sound science and law. All of this has been at the expense of the American taxpayer. What occurred April 30 in U.S. District Judge Terrence Boyle's court in Raleigh changed everything.

It's the piping plover that has become the "poster child" for these groups. The plover is a relative newcomer to CHNSRA. Every bird study conducted between 1900 and 1959 shows that it was not until 1960 that the first birds arrived in the park. Plovers nest independently of one another and not in colonies. They neither feed nor care for their young from the moment they hatch. They nest in areas that are subject to frequent overwash and frequently lose nests as a result. This has already occurred at CHNSRA in the 2008 breeding season, and not just with plovers. Predation has also taken its toll this year.

The piping plovers that nest at CHNSRA are part of the Atlantic breeding population, which is considered "threatened," not endangered. It is very important to understand that CHNSRA is on the extreme southern edge of the plovers' breeding range, which accounts for the historically low numbers within the park. Most plovers nest well north of Cape Hatteras, from Virginia's Eastern Shore to Newfoundland, Canada -- with the majority of nesting occurring mid-range.

I am an individual who has utilized this resource, this national seashore recreation area, for almost three decades. And like many, I am so familiar with this beach system that predicting structure changes, overwash, and the like comes as second nature. Collectively, we possess more first hand knowledge of the workings of the beaches and the wildlife at CHNSRA than any environmental group in existence. It is, therefore, no surprise that an Alberta, Canada, plover study contains the following statement: "Human presence in an area can be a very effective form of predator deterrence." (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 2000) Interesting as well is a statement by Tim Gallagher editor-in-chief of Living Bird magazine, published in the spring 2000 edition, "But the large number of people always present at beaches does have a remarkable taming effect on birds." This reflects what we see daily as we visit our cherished beaches.

There are 21 documented ORV related plover deaths in the entire United States. Twenty of these were committed by federal vehicles. In the 47 years prior to the consent decree, not one single plover death can be attributed to an ORV user in this park. One hundred percent of plover mortality at CHNSRA has been a result of either storms or predation. That is a far cry from the 24 piping plover nests the Army Corps of Engineers destroyed recently in the name of floating two barges of alfalfa pellets down a tributary of the Missouri River.

The Defenders of Wildlife, National Audubon Society, and the Southern Environmental Law Center would have one believe that none of what I write in these pages is true, though it's all in the public record.

The consent decree deals also with other birds, such as black skimmers, common terns, least terns, bull-billed terns, Wilson's plovers, and American oystercatchers. None of these birds are threatened or endangered under the U.S. Endangered Species Act. The consent decree treats them as though they are and at additional taxpayer expense. It also deals with the variety of sea turtles that occasionally nest on the park's beaches, now requiring full beach closures unlike the National Park Service's Interim Strategy.

Some "inconvenient truths" for DOW, Audubon and SELC include the fact that under the Interim Strategy (IMS), the 2007 nesting season was the most successful piping plover breeding season in over 20 years. Currently, under the consent decree, a single plover chick is given enough beach area to cover the decks of three U.S. Navy super aircraft carriers, the largest warships on earth. In most American communities, a convicted child molester can live closer to a public school than a fisherman and his family can get to a plover.

On a positive note, the Atlantic piping plover population is fast approaching 2,000 nesting pairs -- a figure that makes them eligible for de-listing as threatened. The most recent counts show 1,700 nesting pairs. Just four years ago, the most accurate estimate was 1,400 pairs. This represents a rather dramatic increase in breeding pairs in a very short period. Unfortunately, at the cost of even more taxpayer dollars, de-listing the Atlantic plover population is probably going to be challenged in court.

The environmental groups also claim a substantial drop in black skimmer and gull-billed tern numbers. What they don't want you to know is that the bird count for the 2007 season shows a better than 20 percent increase in numbers. They know very well that the birds chose to nest on a newly recreated dredge spoil island within sight of the park because Walker Golder of North Carolina Audubon and also a plaintiff and member of the negotiated rulemaking committee, participated in the study. In reference to this habitat, named Cora June Island, the North Carolina Wildlife Resource Commission writes:

"An outstanding success story can be found on Cora June Island, located near Hatteras Inlet. This island disappeared during Hurricane Isabel in 2003 but was rebuilt in spring 2007 during a dredging project by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. Only months after rising from the sea, the island was home to one of the largest mixed tern/black skimmer colonies in the state with good numbers of nesting adults that successfully fledged hundreds of chicks.

"The recent survey, which was conducted in spring 2007, is one of 10 complete coastwide surveys conducted since the late 1970s to monitor population trends, distribution of colony sites, and nesting habitat conditions. Data gleaned from the surveys help biologists make management and conservation decisions and prioritize research. The next waterbird survey is scheduled for 2010."

They would prefer you to believe that night driving on the beaches at CHNSRA disorients sea turtles. Hence, the ban imposed by the consent decree. But they would have you ignore Pea Island National Wildlife Refuge, the northern 22 miles of beach on Hatteras Island. At Pea Island, there is no beach driving and fewer than a dozen lights visible from the sea. Very few pedestrians frequent these beaches because of the difficulty in accessing them. And yet Pea Island has no greater turtle nesting success than ORV accessible beaches but does have more false crawls and aborted nesting attempts, than the open beaches. They would also have you ignore the fact that plovers don't nest there in spite of the excellent conditions.

Under the Consent Decree, if a turtle nests within the relatively minute portion of beach that's still accessible by ORV, the Park Service is required to establish virtually the same nest enclosure as established within the interim strategy. Beach users may drive by, park by, and fish by this clearly marked 10 foot-by-10 foot cloth revetment at will -- until Sept. 15. On that date, the consent decree imposes full beach closures in addition to the procedures outlined in the interim strategy, making those areas impassable by vehicle or pedestrian. This is absurd and arbitrary. The consent decree clearly states that if a nest is approaching its anticipated hatch date (pre-Sept. 15) NPS is to follow the same procedures outlined in the IMS, not including full beach closures, which means that in spite of the additional "path" NPS constructs to funnel the hatchlings to the sea, the beach immediately outside this small closure is still accessible to both pedestrian and ORV use. So why is Sept. 15, the "magic" day? Because this is an arbitrary date by which perhaps some of the bird closures will have been reduced and the consent decree finally allows for "permitted" night driving. This is a thinly veiled maneuver to continue to prevent ORV access to the beach. If it was okay for me to drive by or park and fish right next the closure on Sept. 14, it should be just fine on Sept. 15.

The environmental groups don't want you to know that at the best of times ORV users can only access less than 30 percent of the beaches at CHNSRA and that their "12 percent of the beaches affected" figure assumes 100 percent ORV access. This has not been true for many, many years. The truth is that well over 90 percent of the beach is currently closed either directly or by default. Areas bounded on both sides by closures are inaccessible even though they are technically open. The groups prefer to focus on ORVs, but the current closures prohibit pedestrian use as well. No entry means just that. It is, I think, ironic that as I labor over this communication, The Defenders of Wildlife have just sent their members an e-mail dated June 15, 2008, that describes success as a result of the consent decree. "Since some of the most sensitive areas were closed to vehicles, birds like the piping plover and the American oystercatcher have been bouncing back."

Plover numbers are the same as they were last year under the interim strategy.

And, according to the most recent available NPS resource management field report, American oystercatcher numbers were better last year under the interim strategy than they are this year under the consent decree. At this point in time last year, American oystercatchers had attempted 41 nests and had 17 active or hatched nests. At this point in 2008, they have attempted 33 nests but have only 16 active or hatched nests. With the extensive closures, this can in no way be blamed on ORV drivers. This completely refutes the claims of the aforementioned environmental groups' press releases that the American oystercatcher is somehow miraculously "bouncing back" as a result of greatly restricted ORV traffic.

The e-mail also states:

"The emergency plan was developed to be flexible, with temporary closures that can be lifted and reopened to vehicles once wildlife is no longer using certain areas. Already, some areas have been reopened this season."

This ignores the rash of immediate closures that followed the April 30 signing of the consent decree. Because of the consent decree, anyone with a cell phone can call NPS, report bird activity, and the Park Service is required to close the area for weeks at a time. All of the areas that have been reopened

as of June 26 were initially closed because of inaccurate and perhaps false observation.

They would rather you didn't think of them as parties to the lawsuit that has prevented the replacement of the Bonner Bridge, Hatteras and Ocracoke islands' lifeline and only over-ground hurricane evacuation route -- a bridge with a safety rating of 4 out of 100. The bridge in Minnesota that collapsed in 2007, killing many, was rated at 27. Since when do we so blatantly condone risking the loss of human life? The environmental groups have already announced that if the new bridge is attempted as planned, they will sue.

The consent decree is an obvious attempt at changing a national seashore recreation area into a private wildlife refuge -- which has, so far, been successful at the cost of untold taxpayer dollars. Remember that the plaintiffs are consistently reimbursed their legal fees and expenses by the already strapped Park Service and Department of Interior. You must also consider the cost of constant monitoring, flying in and housing of unneeded special event teams, additional, extensive new signage, additional vehicles, law enforcement and infrastructure.

The impact of the consent decree on the economies of the villages bounded by the park has been astounding. I know this first hand because it has cost me my job at a business that is suffering economically. Conditions under the consent decree continue to fester as more Americans and foreign visitors discover that the experience they expected when they arrived at CHNSRA has been almost entirely compromised. Some have already cancelled their reservations or vowed not to return. And yet both the environmental groups and United States Fish and Wildlife Service continue to utilize the arguably inept Voglesong study as the foundation of their economic and visitor usage statements, in spite of a government-funded peer review that deems the study essentially worthless. The esteemed panel also regarded the data and its collection methods so flawed that further review of that data would be a waste of time.

The consent decree has changed the very nature of the Park. Though the environmental groups claim to want to preserve CHNSRA for future generations, I fail to see the value of a national park that remains largely inaccessible during the spring, summer, and fall, when the majority of Americans who visit the park take their vacations at this time. And if USFWS gets its way by declaring the seashore as critical wintering habitat for Great Lakes and Great Plains plover populations, though they openly admit they have no idea where the wintering birds originate, this will include the late fall and winter months as well.

Preservation has been, so far, successful without court intervention and a draconian consent decree. What choice did Dare and Hyde counties and the various beach access groups have other than to consent? It came down to either accepting an agreement that they had no voice in and hoping for the best or face certain closure and the enormous economic impact that it would spawn.

A federal judge is bound by law to render a fair decision based upon the merits of the evidence presented before the court. But Judge Boyle declared his intention to provide the environmental groups exactly what they sought without hearing any evidence from either point of view and precluded the intervening parties, Dare and Hyde counties and the Cape Hatteras Access Preservation Alliance, from entering any evidence at all in open court. This occurred within the first few minutes of a February scheduling conference in Boyle's court. At a later hearing, in spite of being charged by law to consider the economic impact of the proposed closures within the consent decree, Judge Boyle repeatedly declared his lack of knowledge and understanding of CHNSRA and the villages contained therein, and signed the decree anyway. His obsession with closing Ramp 4 (Bodie Island Spit) as related in the transcripts of the April hearing is baffling. (Available on Island Free Press Web site. Go to Beach Access Issues Page, go the end of that page, and click on archived stories.)

What the negotiations between the environmental groups and DOI promulgated can only honestly be referred to as a decree of forced consent.

CHNSRA was established first and foremost as a national seashore recreational area. This is blatantly obvious when one reads the enabling legislation formulating and forever establishing the park, which is dated Aug. 17, 1937. It provides in part: Sec. 4. 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?

On June 11, 2008, U.S. Sens. Kay Hagen and Richard Burr and U.S. Rep. Walter B. Jones introduced bills S3113 and HR6233. These bills, if enacted, would put aside the consent decree and return CHNSRA to the management of the Park Service's interim plan. This would effectively take management decisions out of the hands of a few special interest groups and return it to the professional scientists and staff of NPS at a considerable savings to taxpayers over the life of the consent decree.

Already these groups assail the media and their members with tales of doom were these bills signed into law. Some claim that Congress has no business even dealing with this matter. I beg to differ. Congress established this park for the American people and provided us with a place we have fought hard to preserve as the unique and dynamic place that Hatteras is -- or was.

For years, most of us have lived by OBPA's motto, "Preserve, Protect, Not Prohibit." For example, to this day NPS does not employ "beach clean-up crews." We do this on our own time and at our own expense. This hardly represents a user group with a penchant for environmental abuse.

Congress reserved the right to change the nature of an established national park for itself. And so there is no question as to whether these bills should be co-sponsored and enacted.

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."

Surely this applies to forced closures as that constitutes an activity as well. Non-government organizations have taken over scientific management of a national park under this consent decree, an activity not sanctioned by Congress.

I urge the National Park Service to do the right thing and provide access to this resource and stop being influenced by the eco terrorist

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2564    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Hudspeth, Thuy  
**Received:** May,01,2010 13:31:49

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** When Congress established Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area in 1937, its intent was to permanently provide for all Americans a unique area for their enjoyment and use.

For years now, those of us who utilize this unique resource have been under assault by a variety of environmental special interest groups that would deny us, but not themselves, access. And, in each case where evidence was heard from both sides in the court, they were sent packing. Quite simply, their claims were refuted by sound science and law. All of this has been at the expense of the American taxpayer. What occurred April 30 in U.S. District Judge Terrence Boyle's court in Raleigh changed everything.

It's the piping plover that has become the "poster child" for these groups. The plover is a relative newcomer to CHNSRA. Every bird study conducted between 1900 and 1959 shows that it was not until 1960 that the first birds arrived in the park. Plovers nest independently of one another and not in colonies. They neither feed nor care for their young from the moment they hatch. They nest in areas that are subject to frequent overwash and frequently lose nests as a result. This has already occurred at CHNSRA in the 2008 breeding season, and not just with plovers. Predation has also taken its toll this year.

The piping plovers that nest at CHNSRA are part of the Atlantic breeding population, which is considered "threatened," not endangered. It is very important to understand that CHNSRA is on the extreme southern edge of the plovers' breeding range, which accounts for the historically low numbers within the park. Most plovers nest well north of Cape Hatteras, from Virginia's Eastern Shore to Newfoundland, Canada -- with the majority of nesting occurring mid-range.

I am an individual who has utilized this resource, this national seashore recreation area, for almost three decades. And like many, I am so familiar with this beach system that predicting structure changes, overwash, and the like comes as second nature. Collectively, we possess more first hand knowledge of the workings of the beaches and the wildlife at CHNSRA than any environmental group in existence. It is, therefore, no surprise that an Alberta, Canada, plover study contains the following statement: "Human presence in an area can be a very effective form of predator deterrence." (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 2000) Interesting as well is a statement by Tim Gallagher editor-in-chief of Living Bird magazine, published in the spring 2000 edition, "But the large number of people always present at beaches does have a remarkable taming effect on birds." This reflects what we see daily as

we visit our cherished beaches.

There are 21 documented ORV related plover deaths in the entire United States. Twenty of these were committed by federal vehicles. In the 47 years prior to the consent decree, not one single plover death can be attributed to an ORV user in this park. One hundred percent of plover mortality at CHNSRA has been a result of either storms or predation. That is a far cry from the 24 piping plover nests the Army Corps of Engineers destroyed recently in the name of floating two barges of alfalfa pellets down a tributary of the Missouri River.

The Defenders of Wildlife, National Audubon Society, and the Southern Environmental Law Center would have one believe that none of what I write in these pages is true, though it's all in the public record.

The consent decree deals also with other birds, such as black skimmers, common terns, least terns, bull-billed terns, Wilson's plovers, and American oystercatchers. None of these birds are threatened or endangered under the U.S. Endangered Species Act. The consent decree treats them as though they are and at additional taxpayer expense. It also deals with the variety of sea turtles that occasionally nest on the park's beaches, now requiring full beach closures unlike the National Park Service's Interim Strategy.

Some "inconvenient truths" for DOW, Audubon and SELC include the fact that under the Interim Strategy (IMS), the 2007 nesting season was the most successful piping plover breeding season in over 20 years. Currently, under the consent decree, a single plover chick is given enough beach area to cover the decks of three U.S. Navy super aircraft carriers, the largest warships on earth. In most American communities, a convicted child molester can live closer to a public school than a fisherman and his family can get to a plover.

On a positive note, the Atlantic piping plover population is fast approaching 2,000 nesting pairs -- a figure that makes them eligible for de-listing as threatened. The most recent counts show 1,700 nesting pairs. Just four years ago, the most accurate estimate was 1,400 pairs. This represents a rather dramatic increase in breeding pairs in a very short period. Unfortunately, at the cost of even more taxpayer dollars, de-listing the Atlantic plover population is probably going to be challenged in court.

The environmental groups also claim a substantial drop in black skimmer and gull-billed tern numbers. What they don't want you to know is that the bird count for the 2007 season shows a better than 20 percent increase in numbers. They know very well that the birds chose to nest on a newly recreated dredge spoil island within sight of the park because Walker Golder of North Carolina Audubon and also a plaintiff and member of the negotiated rulemaking committee, participated in the study. In reference to this habitat, named Cora June Island, the North Carolina Wildlife Resource Commission writes:

"An outstanding success story can be found on Cora June Island, located near Hatteras Inlet. This island disappeared during Hurricane Isabel in 2003 but was rebuilt in spring 2007 during a dredging project by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. Only months after rising from the sea, the island was home to one of the largest mixed tern/black skimmer colonies in the state with good numbers of nesting adults that successfully fledged hundreds of chicks.

"The recent survey, which was conducted in spring 2007, is one of 10 complete coastwide surveys conducted since the late 1970s to monitor population trends, distribution of colony sites, and nesting habitat conditions. Data gleaned from the surveys help biologists make management and conservation decisions and prioritize research. The next waterbird survey is scheduled for 2010. "

They would prefer you to believe that night driving on the beaches at CHNSRA disorients sea turtles. Hence, the ban imposed by the consent decree.

But they would have you ignore Pea Island National Wildlife Refuge, the northern 22 miles of beach on Hatteras Island. At Pea Island, there is no beach driving and fewer than a dozen lights visible from the sea. Very few pedestrians frequent these beaches because of the difficulty in accessing them. And yet Pea Island has no greater turtle nesting success than ORV accessible beaches but does have more false crawls and aborted nesting attempts, than the open beaches. They would also have you ignore the fact that plovers don't nest there in spite of the excellent conditions.

Under the Consent Decree, if a turtle nests within the relatively minute portion of beach that's still accessible by ORV, the Park Service is required to establish virtually the same nest enclosure as established within the interim strategy. Beach users may drive by, park by, and fish by this clearly marked 10 foot-by-10 foot cloth revetment at will -- until Sept. 15. On that date, the consent decree imposes full beach closures in addition to the procedures outlined in the interim strategy, making those areas impassable by vehicle or pedestrian. This is absurd and arbitrary. The consent decree clearly states that if a nest is approaching its anticipated hatch date (pre-Sept. 15) NPS is to follow the same procedures outlined in the IMS, not including full beach closures, which means that in spite of the additional "path" NPS constructs to funnel the hatchlings to the sea, the beach immediately outside this small closure is still accessible to both pedestrian and ORV use. So why is Sept. 15, the "magic" day? Because this is an arbitrary date by which perhaps some of the bird closures will have been reduced and the consent decree finally allows for "permitted" night driving. This is a thinly veiled maneuver to continue to prevent ORV access to the beach. If it was okay for me to drive by or park and fish right next the closure on Sept. 14, it should be just fine on Sept. 15.

The environmental groups don't want you to know that at the best of times ORV users can only access less than 30 percent of the beaches at CHNSRA and that their "12 percent of the beaches affected" figure assumes 100 percent ORV access. This has not been true for many, many years. The truth is that well over 90 percent of the beach is currently closed either directly or by default. Areas bounded on both sides by closures are inaccessible even though they are technically open. The groups prefer to focus on ORVs, but the current closures prohibit pedestrian use as well. No entry means just that. It is, I think, ironic that as I labor over this communication, The Defenders of Wildlife have just sent their members an e-mail dated June 15, 2008, that describes success as a result of the consent decree. "Since some of the most sensitive areas were closed to vehicles, birds like the piping plover and the American oystercatcher have been bouncing back."

Plover numbers are the same as they were last year under the interim strategy.

And, according to the most recent available NPS resource management field report, American oystercatcher numbers were better last year under the interim strategy than they are this year under the consent decree. At this point in time last year, American oystercatchers had attempted 41 nests and had 17 active or hatched nests. At this point in 2008, they have attempted 33 nests but have only 16 active or hatched nests. With the extensive closures, this can in no way be blamed on ORV drivers. This completely refutes the claims of the aforementioned environmental groups' press releases that the American oystercatcher is somehow miraculously "bouncing back" as a result of greatly restricted ORV traffic.

The e-mail also states:

"The emergency plan was developed to be flexible, with temporary closures that can be lifted and reopened to vehicles once wildlife is no longer using certain areas. Already, some areas have been reopened this season."

This ignores the rash of immediate closures that followed the April 30 signing of the consent decree. Because of the consent decree, anyone with a cell phone can call NPS, report bird activity, and the Park Service is required to close the area for weeks at a time. All of the areas that have been reopened as of June 26 were initially closed because of inaccurate and perhaps false observation.

They would rather you didn't think of them as parties to the lawsuit that has prevented the replacement of the Bonner Bridge, Hatteras and Ocracoke islands' lifeline and only over-ground hurricane evacuation route -- a bridge with a safety rating of 4 out of 100. The bridge in Minnesota that collapsed in 2007, killing many, was rated at 27. Since when do we so blatantly condone risking the loss of human life? The environmental groups have already announced that if the new bridge is attempted as planned, they will sue.

The consent decree is an obvious attempt at changing a national seashore recreation area into a private wildlife refuge -- which has, so far, been successful at the cost of untold taxpayer dollars. Remember that the plaintiffs are consistently reimbursed their legal fees and expenses by the already strapped Park Service and Department of Interior. You must also consider the cost of constant monitoring, flying in and housing of unneeded special event teams, additional, extensive new signage, additional vehicles, law enforcement and infrastructure.

The impact of the consent decree on the economies of the villages bounded by the park has been astounding. I know this first hand because it has cost me my job at a business that is suffering economically. Conditions under the consent decree continue to fester as more Americans and foreign visitors discover that the experience they expected when they arrived at CHNSRA has been almost entirely compromised. Some have already cancelled their reservations or vowed not to return. And yet both the environmental groups and United States Fish and Wildlife Service continue to utilize the arguably inept Voglesong study as the foundation of their economic and visitor usage statements, in spite of a government-funded peer review that deems the study essentially worthless. The esteemed panel also regarded the data and its collection methods so flawed that further review of that data would be a waste of time.

The consent decree has changed the very nature of the Park. Though the environmental groups claim to want to preserve CHNSRA for future generations, I fail to see the value of a national park that remains largely inaccessible during the spring, summer, and fall, when the majority of Americans who visit the park take their vacations at this time. And if USFWS gets its way by declaring the seashore as critical wintering habitat for

Great Lakes and Great Plains plover populations, though they openly admit they have no idea where the wintering birds originate, this will include the late fall and winter months as well.

Preservation has been, so far, successful without court intervention and a draconian consent decree. What choice did Dare and Hyde counties and the various beach access groups have other than to consent? It came down to either accepting an agreement that they had no voice in and hoping for the best or face certain closure and the enormous economic impact that it would spawn.

A federal judge is bound by law to render a fair decision based upon the merits of the evidence presented before the court. But Judge Boyle declared his intention to provide the environmental groups exactly what they sought without hearing any evidence from either point of view and precluded the intervening parties, Dare and Hyde counties and the Cape Hatteras Access Preservation Alliance, from entering any evidence at all in open court. This occurred within the first few minutes of a February scheduling conference in Boyle's court. At a later hearing, in spite of being charged by law to consider the economic impact of the proposed closures within the consent decree, Judge Boyle repeatedly declared his lack of knowledge and understanding of CHNSRA and the villages contained therein, and signed the decree anyway. His obsession with closing Ramp 4 (Bodie Island Spit) as related in the transcripts of the April hearing is baffling. (Available on Island Free Press Web site. Go to Beach Access Issues Page, go the end of that page, and click on archived stories.)

What the negotiations between the environmental groups and DOI promulgated can only honestly be referred to as a decree of forced consent. CHNSRA was established first and foremost as a national seashore recreational area. This is blatantly obvious when one reads the enabling legislation formulating and forever establishing the park, which is dated Aug. 17, 1937. It provides in part: Sec. 4. 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?

On June 11, 2008, U.S. Sens. Kay Hagen and Richard Burr and U.S. Rep. Walter B. Jones introduced bills S3113 and HR6233. These bills, if enacted, would put aside the consent decree and return CHNSRA to the management of the Park Service's interim plan. This would effectively take management decisions out of the hands of a few special interest groups and return it to the professional scientists and staff of NPS at a considerable savings to taxpayers over the life of the consent decree.

Already these groups assail the media and their members with tales of doom were these bills signed into law. Some claim that Congress has no business even dealing with this matter. I beg to differ. Congress established this park for the American people and provided us with a place we have fought hard to preserve as the unique and dynamic place that Hatteras is -- or was.

For years, most of us have lived by OBPA's motto, "Preserve, Protect, Not Prohibit." For example, to this day NPS does not employ "beach clean-up crews." We do this on our own time and at our own expense. This hardly represents a user group with a penchant for environmental abuse.

Congress reserved the right to change the nature of an established national park for itself. And so there is no question as to whether these bills should be co-sponsored and enacted.

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."

Surely this applies to forced closures as that constitutes an activity as well. Non-government organizations have taken over scientific management of a national park under this consent decree, an activity not sanctioned by Congress.

I urge the National Park Service to do the right thing and provide access to this resource and stop being influenced by the eco terrorist

**Correspondence ID:** 2565    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,01,2010 13:32:54

**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:** 2566    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,01,2010 13:32:54

**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:** 2567    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Hudspeth, Steve N

**Received:** May,01,2010 13:41:25

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:**

Dear Congressman: I am most concerned about the current crisis in our National Parks. I am sure you would agree that the parks were set-aside for all the citizens of this fine nation to enjoy, protect and preserve. My immediate concern is the current status of Cape Hatteras Recreation Area; this area is a beautiful piece of America that should be enjoyed by all Americans. At its inception this seashore was divided into distinct areas' meant to balance the mission of protection and preservation along with an area set aside for recreation. The people who established the park wisely set aside 13 mile long Pea Island National Wildlife Refuge to protect migratory and shore birds. The Cape Hatteras Recreation Area was meant for the people to enjoy, it was also touted to be a great economic engine which it has proven to be. A long tradition of surf fishing has been the main stay of this economy. When Congress created the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area in 1953, only sand roads existed! Beach driving was and has always been a way of life here. At that time, land owned by many local residents was transferred to the Federal Government to be a part of the designated National Seashore. In the negotiations for this land, the United States Government promised the residents of Hatteras and Ocracoke who gave up their land, that traditional access, such as beach driving, would be honored. We do not have traditional beach accesses such as boardwalks and numerous large parking lots with easy paths to flat beaches. Our beaches are vast, remote and protected by sand dunes. We have designated ramps for four-wheel drive access. Beach driving is essential to accessing many of our beaches, especially for people who are elderly, infirmed or handicapped, and small children who cannot walk three miles in thick sand to see the famous Diamond Shoals or inlets. It is important to note also, that in order to clearly differentiate land as a wildlife refuge and land as recreational use area, Congress designated Cape Hatteras National Seashore as a Recreational Area. The clearly stated intent of Congress was to provide locals and vacationers an area to enjoy activities such as camping, surf fishing, boating, kiteboarding, surfing, beachcombing, etc. A small group of out-of-state environmentalists now want the government to break that promise and ban beach driving. Additionally, they want to usurp traditional recreational land, such as Cape Point, and designate it as wildlife refuge, restricting human access to the most famous surf-fishing spot on the East Coast. Already, over 85% of our island is protected by law against further development, so that the natural habitat may continue to flourish. Extreme environmentalists claim that a prohibition of beach driving will "save" the piping plover, which have been spotted infrequently on Cape Hatteras. In fact, from 1902-1960 no piping plover nests were ever spotted on Cape Hatteras. Since 1901, there have never been more than fifteen breeding pairs of piping plovers, ever, at one time, on the island. An abundance of feral cats, gulls, fox, and Mother Nature in the form of high storm and lunar tides, have resulted in unsuccessful nesting. Although the National Park Service does not have a formal beach driving management plan, they have an interim plan, and are developing a long-term plan so that a balance between recreational use and wildlife protection is upheld. Local residents, business owners, government representatives, sports enthusiasts, and also environmentalists have all been working with them to ensure that all interests are represented in the plan-making process. This is a federally commissioned group to ensure that a democratic process prevails and that recreational use and wildlife protection can exist in harmony. Unfortunately, extreme environmentalists have chosen to bypass the agreed upon democratic process, and now seek drastic action that will significantly and detrimentally impact local communities and vacationing families. Judge Terrence Boyle has been extremely bias and has inserted his own doctrine into this process and our National Park is being regulated by a judge rather than through a congressional process. I believe this to be unconstitutional. The current consent decree was not a compromise and is not fair. Please provide leadership that protects the wildlife and protects the people's rights to access their national parks. Remember many beaches in Cape Hatteras National Seashore And Recreational Area Can not be accessed without ORV. That's the Wonderful aspect of this beautiful place.

Sincerely,

**Correspondence ID:** 2568    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Hudspeth, David A

**Received:** May,01,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:**

Dear Congressman: I am most concerned about the current crisis in our National Parks. I am sure you would agree that the parks were set-aside for all the citizens of this fine nation to enjoy, protect and preserve. My immediate concern is the current status of Cape Hatteras Recreation Area; this area is a beautiful piece of America that should be enjoyed by all Americans. At its inception this seashore was divided into distinct areas' meant to balance the mission of protection and preservation along with an area set aside for recreation. The people who established the park wisely set aside 13 mile long Pea Island National Wildlife Refuge to protect migratory and shore birds. The Cape Hatteras Recreation Area was meant for the people to enjoy, it was also touted to be a great economic engine which it has proven to be. A long tradition of surf fishing has been the main stay of this economy. When Congress created the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area in 1953, only sand roads existed! Beach driving was and has always been a way of life here. At that time, land owned by many local residents was transferred to the Federal Government to be a part of the designated National Seashore. In the negotiations for this land, the United States Government promised the residents of Hatteras and Ocracoke who gave up their land, that traditional access, such as beach driving, would be honored. We do not have traditional beach accesses such as boardwalks and numerous large parking lots with easy paths to flat beaches. Our beaches are vast, remote and protected by sand dunes. We have designated ramps for four-wheel drive access. Beach driving is essential to accessing many of our beaches, especially for people who are elderly, infirmed or handicapped, and small children who cannot walk three miles in thick sand to see the famous Diamond Shoals or inlets. It is important to note also, that in order to clearly differentiate land as a wildlife refuge and land as recreational use area, Congress designated Cape Hatteras National Seashore as a Recreational Area. The clearly stated intent of Congress was to provide locals and vacationers an area to enjoy activities such as camping, surf fishing, boating, kiteboarding, surfing, beachcombing, etc. A small group of out-of-state environmentalists now want the government to break that promise and ban beach driving. Additionally, they want to usurp traditional recreational land, such as Cape Point, and designate it as wildlife refuge, restricting human access to the most famous surf-fishing spot on the East Coast. Already, over 85% of our island is protected by law against further development, so that the natural habitat may continue to flourish. Extreme environmentalists claim that a prohibition of beach driving will "save" the piping plover, which have been spotted infrequently on Cape Hatteras. In fact, from 1902-1960 no piping plover nests were ever spotted on Cape Hatteras. Since 1901, there have never been more than fifteen breeding pairs of piping plovers, ever, at one time, on the island. An abundance of feral cats, gulls, fox, and Mother Nature in the form of high storm and lunar tides, have resulted in unsuccessful nesting. Although the National Park Service does not have a formal beach driving management plan, they have an interim plan, and are developing a long-term plan so that a balance between recreational use and wildlife protection is upheld. Local residents, business owners, government representatives, sports enthusiasts, and also environmentalists have all been working with them to ensure that all interests are represented in the plan-making process. This is a federally commissioned group to ensure that a democratic process prevails and that recreational use and wildlife protection can exist in harmony. Unfortunately, extreme environmentalists have chosen to bypass the agreed upon democratic process, and now seek drastic action that will significantly and detrimentally impact local communities and vacationing families. Judge Terrence Boyle has been extremely bias and has inserted his own doctrine into this process and our National Park is being regulated by a judge rather than through a congressional process. I believe this to be unconstitutional. The current consent decree was not a compromise and is not fair. Please provide leadership that protects the wildlife and protects the people's rights to access their national parks. Remember many beaches in Cape Hatteras National Seashore And Recreational Area Can not be accessed without ORV. That's the Wonderful aspect of this beautiful place.

Sincerely,

**Correspondence ID:** 2569    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Reavis, Dan  
**Received:** May,01,2010 13:48:02  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:**

Dear Congressman: I am most concerned about the current crisis in our National Parks. I am sure you would agree that the parks were set-aside for all the citizens of this fine nation to enjoy, protect and preserve. My immediate concern is the current status of Cape Hatteras Recreation Area; this area is a beautiful piece of America that should be enjoyed by all Americans. At its inception this seashore was divided into distinct areas' meant to balance the mission of protection and preservation along with an area set aside for recreation. The people who established the park wisely set aside 13 mile long Pea Island National Wildlife Refuge to protect migratory and shore birds. The Cape Hatteras Recreation Area was meant for the people to enjoy, it was also touted to be a great economic engine which it has proven to be. A long tradition of surf fishing has been the main stay of this economy. When Congress created the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area in 1953, only sand roads existed! Beach driving was and has always been a way of life here. At that time, land owned by many local residents was transferred to the Federal Government to be a part of the designated National Seashore. In the negotiations for this land, the United States Government promised the residents of Hatteras and Ocracoke who gave up their land, that traditional access, such as beach driving, would be honored. We do not have traditional beach accesses such as boardwalks and numerous large parking lots with easy paths to flat beaches. Our beaches are vast, remote and protected by sand dunes. We have designated ramps for four-wheel drive access. Beach driving is essential to accessing many of our beaches, especially for people who are elderly, infirmed or handicapped, and small children who cannot walk three miles in thick sand to see the famous Diamond Shoals or inlets. It is important to note also, that in order to clearly differentiate land as a wildlife refuge and land as recreational use area, Congress designated Cape Hatteras National Seashore as a Recreational Area. The clearly stated intent of Congress was to provide locals and vacationers an area to enjoy activities such as camping, surf fishing, boating, kiteboarding, surfing, beachcombing, etc. A small group of out-of-state environmentalists now want the government to break that promise and ban beach driving. Additionally, they want to usurp traditional recreational land, such as Cape Point, and designate it as wildlife refuge, restricting human access to the most famous surf-fishing spot on the East Coast. Already, over 85% of our island is protected by law against further development, so that the natural habitat may continue to flourish. Extreme environmentalists claim that a prohibition of beach driving will "save" the piping plover, which have been spotted infrequently on Cape Hatteras. In fact, from 1902-1960 no piping plover nests were ever spotted on Cape Hatteras. Since 1901, there have never been more than fifteen breeding pairs of piping plovers, ever, at one time, on the island. An abundance of feral cats, gulls, fox, and Mother Nature in the form of high storm and lunar tides, have resulted in unsuccessful nesting. Although the National Park Service does not have a formal beach driving management plan, they have an interim plan, and are developing a long-term plan so that a balance between recreational use and wildlife protection is upheld. Local residents, business owners, government representatives, sports enthusiasts, and also environmentalists have all been working with them to ensure that all interests are represented in the plan-making process. This is a federally commissioned group to ensure that a democratic process prevails and that recreational use and wildlife protection can exist in harmony. Unfortunately, extreme environmentalists have chosen to bypass the agreed upon democratic process, and now seek drastic action that will significantly and detrimentally impact local communities and vacationing families. Judge Terrence Boyle has been extremely bias and has inserted his own doctrine into this process and our National Park is being regulated by a judge rather than through a congressional process. I believe this to be unconstitutional. The current consent decree was not a compromise and is not fair. Please provide leadership that protects the wildlife and protects the people's rights to access their national parks. Remember many beaches in Cape Hatteras National Seashore And Recreational Area Can not be accessed without ORV. That's the Wonderful aspect of this beautiful place.

Sincerely,

**Correspondence ID:** 2570    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Patterson, Steven P  
**Received:** May,01,2010 13:53:36  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:**

: I am most concerned about access to Cape Hatteras National Sea Shore And Recreational I am sure you would agree that the parks were set-aside for all the citizens of this fine nation to enjoy, protect and preserve. My immediate concern is the current status of Cape Hatteras Recreation Area; this area is a beautiful piece of America that should be enjoyed by all Americans. At its inception this seashore was divided into distinct areas' meant to balance the mission of protection and preservation along with an area set aside for recreation. The people who established the park wisely set aside 13 mile long Pea Island National Wildlife Refuge to protect migratory and shore birds. The Cape Hatteras Recreation Area was meant for the people to enjoy, it was also touted to be a great economic engine which it has proven to be. A long tradition of surf fishing has been the main stay of this economy. When Congress created the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area in 1953, only sand roads existed! Beach driving was and has always been a way of life here. At that time, land owned by many local residents was transferred to the Federal Government to be a part of the designated National Seashore. In the negotiations for this land, the United States Government promised the residents of Hatteras and Ocracoke who gave up their land, that traditional access, such as beach driving, would be honored. We do not have traditional beach accesses such as boardwalks and numerous large parking lots with easy paths to flat beaches. Our beaches are vast, remote and protected by sand dunes. We have designated ramps for four-wheel drive access. Beach driving is essential to accessing many of our beaches, especially for people who are elderly, infirmed or handicapped, and small children who cannot walk three miles in thick sand to see the famous Diamond Shoals or inlets. It is important to note also, that in order to clearly differentiate land as a wildlife refuge and land as recreational use area, Congress designated Cape Hatteras National Seashore as a Recreational Area. The clearly stated intent of Congress was to provide locals and vacationers an area to enjoy activities such as camping, surf fishing, boating, kiteboarding, surfing, beachcombing, etc. A small group of out-of-state environmentalists now want the government to break that promise and ban beach driving. Additionally, they want to usurp traditional recreational land, such as Cape Point, and designate it as wildlife refuge, restricting human access to the most famous surf-fishing spot on the East Coast. Already, over 85% of our island is protected by law against further development, so that the natural habitat may continue to flourish. Extreme environmentalists claim that a prohibition of beach driving will "save" the piping plover, which have been spotted infrequently on Cape Hatteras. In fact, from 1902-1960 no piping plover nests were ever spotted on Cape Hatteras. Since 1901, there have never been more than fifteen breeding pairs of piping plovers, ever, at one time, on the island. An abundance of feral cats, gulls, fox, and Mother Nature in the form of high storm and lunar tides, have resulted in unsuccessful nesting. Although the National Park Service does not have a formal beach driving management plan, they have an interim plan, and are developing a long-term plan so that a balance between recreational use and wildlife protection is upheld. Local residents, business owners, government representatives, sports enthusiasts, and also environmentalists have all been working with them to ensure that all interests are represented in the plan-making process. This is a federally commissioned group to ensure that a democratic process prevails and that recreational use and wildlife protection can exist in harmony. Unfortunately, extreme environmentalists have chosen to bypass the agreed upon democratic process, and now seek drastic action that will significantly and detrimentally impact local communities and vacationing families. Judge Terrence Boyle has been extremely bias and has inserted his own doctrine into this process and our National Park is being regulated by a judge rather than through a congressional process. I believe this to be unconstitutional. The current consent decree was not a compromise and is not fair. Please provide leadership that protects the wildlife and protects the people's rights to access their national parks. Remember many beaches in Cape Hatteras National Seashore And Recreational Area Can not be accessed without ORV. That's the Wonderful aspect of this beautiful place.

Sincerely,

**Correspondence ID:** 2571    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,01,2010 14:02:54  
**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:** 2572    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,01,2010 14:03:01

**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:** 2573    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,01,2010 14:03:01

**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:** 2574    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,01,2010 14:33:01

**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:** 2575    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,01,2010 14:33:07

**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:** 2576    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,01,2010 14:33:07

**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:** 2577    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,01,2010 14:38:21

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I support open and accessible beaches for the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area. Piping plover are not endangered and we as people

work to help the animal and wildlife. Why should they have more protection than people? Please help keep our beaches OPEN for the people, the economy and for all who care about this beautiful Outer Banks.  
Thank you!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2578    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,01,2010 14:57:47  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Sir,  
 I have been visiting Hatteras Island for 31 years. I love the Outer Banks so much that my husband and I chose to purchase property in Avon, NC. We have raised three children to have a love and a respect for these beautiful and fragile barrier islands. My mother, son, and myself are all handicapped. We love to come to the Hatteras Island to be able to drive on the beach to see the ocean. We are all unable to walk over the double sets of dunes to access the ocean. We support open public access to all beaches on Hatteras Island. By limiting access to 50% of the beaches on the Island is infringing on our ability to enjoy the ocean. We support allowing the National Park Service to act as caretakers of America's natural resources for the benefit of the AMERICAN PEOPLE. The birds and local wildlife are protected in land set aside for them both north and south of Hatteras Island. The Pea Island N.W.R. at the north end of Hatteras Island serves this purpose perfectly. It is for the birds and the WILDLIFE! The NATIONAL SEASHORE is for PEOPLE. The Shackleford Banks and Portsmouth Island to the south of Ocracoke are uninhabited islands completely accessible for wildlife. Please allow Hatteras Island to be used by the people for the benefit of ALL American people. The year round inhabitants of Hatteras Island are facing real economic hardship due to the poor economy AND the super-restrictive beach closures. The number of weekly rentals at our beach house has dropped by 50%. The Island needs to have the access to the point and the Ocracoke/Hatteras Inlet year round. Please restore access to all Hatteras Beaches year round. Please allow Humans to use all the beaches in the Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Let the birds have the "wildlife" areas, and let the people have the National Parks. Thank you,  
 Ruth Marotto A concerned citizen and taxpayer.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2579    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,01,2010 15:03:12  
**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:** 2580    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,01,2010 15:03:12  
**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:** 2581    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,01,2010 15:03:12

**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:** 2582    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,01,2010 15:03:14

**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:** 2583    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,01,2010 15:03:14

**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:** 2584    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,01,2010 15:33:15

**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:** 2585    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,01,2010 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. These areas, near where I was born are critical to the birds and other wildlife in these coastal areas that use them breeding, migration, or just plain live there year round. Enough damage has been done. I think Alternative D is okay, consider these thoughts in making a 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. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

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

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

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

**Correspondence ID:** 2586    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,01,2010 15:33:16

**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:** 2587    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,01,2010 15:33:16

**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:** 2588    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,01,2010 15:53:13

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I do not like the size of the bird closures. Much too large and restrictive. Smaller closure areas that protect nesting are more realistic. Alt f seems to be good except for being overly restrictive.  
Am also concerned that the maps I view showing beach open to driving are beaches where no one can truly drive. Like most of the beach north of Buxton to Avon. No way anyone could drive on that bad beach. It should be listed as inaccessible by nature and not counted as open beach.

**Correspondence ID:** 2589    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,01,2010 16:03:14

**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.  
DEAR SUPERINTENDENT MURRAY,  
I WRITE IN REGARD TO THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENT IMPACT STATEMENT.  
A PLACE FOR ALL UNDERLIES MY MESSAGE. THERE  
MUST BE AN ADEQUATE SPACE AND PROTECTION  
FOR WILDLIFE AND A PLACE FOR RESPONSIBLE  
BEACH DRIVERS.  
MARY KUSTER 409 OVERLAND DRIVE SPARTANBURG, SC. 29307

**Correspondence ID:** 2590    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,01,2010 16:03:14

**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:** 2591    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,01,2010 16:03:18

**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:** 2592    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,01,2010 16:03:20  
**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:** 2593    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,01,2010 16:33:20  
**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:** 2594    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,01,2010 16:33:21  
**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:** 2595    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,01,2010 16:33:23  
**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:** 2596    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,01,2010 16:33:24  
**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:** 2597    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,01,2010 16:33:32  
**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:** 2598    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,01,2010 16:33:34

**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:** 2599    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,01,2010 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:** 2600    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,01,2010 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:** 2601    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,01,2010 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:** 2602    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,01,2010 17:03:23  
**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:** 2603    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,01,2010 17:03:23  
**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:** 2604    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,01,2010 17:33:14  
**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:** 2605    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,01,2010 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, and to the planet. There is NO reason why ORVs, which are loud, polluting and intrusive, should have access to the National Seashore. We all have a responsibility to protect and conserve our wildlife, wilderness areas, wildlife, seas and birds, and it is essential that we do so.  
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. NO ORVs should be allowed - they cause far too much damage to our fragile environment, and should be prohibited.

**Correspondence ID:** 2606    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,01,2010 17:33:20  
**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.

0009541

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

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

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

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2607    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Holcomb, Brad

**Received:** May,01,2010 17:34:14

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am contacting you regarding the environmental impact study for the ORV management plan for Cape Hatteras National Seashore and recreational Area. This plan is very much so influenced by the radical environmental lobby groups. I am deeply troubled and down right upset. As you may know, these radical groups only care about their own interests and do not care about making a fair compromise. We need you to take a stand for the people. This important issue is not just about driving on the beach. It is about accessing our favorite areas in the park. This radicalism is taking place all over the nation and access to our favorite national parks are being jeopardized. I and many other beach goers have personally volunteered many times in the park picking up trash that washed up from the ocean and other tasks that the rangers need help with. Not once have I ever seen anyone from the Defenders of Wildlife, The Southern Environmental Law Center or the Audubon helping out in the park. They just want to take away people's rights. We already have a 13-mile long wildlife refuge near Hatteras call Pea Island. Isn't this enough? The radical environmentalist are relentless and well funded, they will not stop suing until they have it all. We need your help now. I feel sorry for the next generation like my son who has a lifetime fishing license. He might not have the same opportunities that we have had.  
Sincerely,

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2608    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Tart, Christopher B

**Received:** May,01,2010 17:36:07

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** The National Seashore was established to maintain public access to a national treasure. Special interest groups such as Audobon society should not be able to dictate what access is to be had on any stretch of public land. The endangered and/or protected bird species have faired worst this past year than before even with all the additional closures. There is no science in any of their claims. Their peer review articles are a joke. Most likely, predators do much more damage than ORV's do on the national seashore. Nature will find a way. ORV users on the national seashore are an asset in my opinion. We stop and pick up trash that may have been washed up by shipping waste, etc. We are good stewards of the land and leave it better than we found it. The national seashore should remain open to ORV access year round and along the entire stretch of shore it encompasses. Closures for nesting turtles are understood and I gladly abide by those closures. The bird closures are a different matter entirely. There is no science to support ORV restrictions to support the nesting habits of these birds. On the contrary, this past year has suggested otherwise. Maybe, just maybe, ORV's help keep the predators at bay and further away from these nesting birds. Just a thought. The economies, community spirit, and livelihoods of generations of locals along the stretches of our national treasure will be put at jeopardy with any more closures of our national treasure because folks like me who vacation here will no longer be allowed to buy bait from them, food from them, gas from them, etc.  
Sincerely, Chris Tart

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2609    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Tart, Christopher B

**Received:** May,01,2010 17:51:02

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I posted an earlier comment but left out 1 major point. Alternative F is entirely too restrictive and is not science based. Much of the plaintiffs side is bad science and to call it peer reviewed calls for serious ethical concerns. To call for more closures to ORV access, to close entire areas of the seashore year round to pedestrian and ORV access, to make the bird closures 100 meter buffer zones... all of that is way over the top and far too restrictive. I am entirely against Alternative F as it will further limit access for many who love to use our national treasure and will deter visitors and vacationers alike who use ORVs to access this wonderland. Alternative F needs to be redone if it is the NPS's preferred alternative because it is a stepping stone into more restrictions in the near future. If the plaintiffs had their way, the entire seashore would be closed based off of bad science and birds who are getting eaten by predators more so now than they were last year due to the limits that have been placed on ORV access.  
Sincerely,  
Chris Tart, PharmD

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2610    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,01,2010 18:03:18

**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:** 2611    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,01,2010 18:03:24  
**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 animals must not be disturbed. This beach belongs to them as much as to the people. ORV users seem to think that the beach belongs only to them. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2612    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,01,2010 18:03:24  
**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:** 2613    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,01,2010 18:03:31  
**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. At 62 years of age, I have been fortunate to have visited most of our parks. The very specialness of them is the unique wildlife each one shelters. We must preserve this precious wildlife in the parks while enjoying them.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at

least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

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

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

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

**Correspondence ID:** 2614    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,01,2010 18:03:31  
**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:** 2615    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,01,2010 18:03:31  
**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:** 2616    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,01,2010 18:33:24  
**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:** 2617    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,01,2010 18:33:24  
**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:** 2618    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,01,2010 18:54:12  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I believe that the arrangement between N.P.S. and locals has been very good over the years. Outside special interests are now being allowed to strike fear into the hearts of the leadership of the N.P.S. and our elected representatives. I wish that we had a decent attorney to fight this FOR local interests. The amount of beach area being closed is totally unnecessary when the actual number of nests, etc. is considered. Pre nesting areas are in and of themselves pointless. The birds that do nest here aren't going to be interested in a "reserved area" for them. The size of the areas being blocked off for EACH NEST is ludicrous to the extreme. Finally, it seems to me that things have been going quite well for all involved parties / species and that for reasons identifiable by the increase in tax free revenues for the Audubon Society and Friends of Wildlife, the publicity, (free), and notoriety garnered by using the ignorance of true facts by the people in general, we are losing our battle to retain the promise of a National Park system, and hold onto the belief that in America, the majority rules. Our politicians have their hands tied by an "appointed" judge and we cannot seek an IMPARTIAL jurist. My family, the Williamsons of Avon, still retain papers that state that the area from Little Kinnakeet to the present village was lent, by them, to the Coast Guard / N.P.S. I believe that as a last ditch effort, the original owners of the properties concerned should be allowed to revoke their agreements made in the past, as the groups holding these properties now have already made the promised use of the properties null and void.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2619    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** SENIOR, JOE L  
**Received:** May,01,2010 19:01:46  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** TO those who may care, I have been visiting the outer banks for more than 10 years. Myself and my friends have spent one week in November and sometimes one week in May. We come to fish and enjoy the natural beautiful "National Seashore" that has been set aside for all to enjoy for eternity. We care about our natural resources. We are concerned for those people who take great care of us while we visit, from tackle shops to where we go to eat and buy souvenirs. We usually stay in the Avon area but have stayed in Ocracoke on occasion. This land belongs to all Americans to swim, fish, surf, walk horseback ride, to be available to experience. Take the responsibility to truly look at what the original intent of the national seashore and recreation for all citizens means. I am convinced the argument about endangered species and habitat is not being done in a true, honest, objective manner. I can't believe if the beach access is limited or closed altogether and for some reason off shore drilling takes place. The recent accident in the Gulf of Mexico is evidence that environmental disasters happen. Open the ramps, monitor the birds and turtles, use common sense.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2620    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,01,2010 19:03:39  
**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:** 2621    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,01,2010 19:03:39

**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:** 2622    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,01,2010 19:03:40

**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:** 2623    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,01,2010 19:03:40

**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:

0009546

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

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

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

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts 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 PLEASE put the plight of sea turtles and birds ahead of the demands of Off-Road vehicle use. Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2624    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,01,2010 19:14:12  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I support off road vehicle use on Hatteras beach. Raccoons and foxes do most of the predation on turtles and plovers,not off road vehicles.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2625    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,01,2010 19:33:21  
**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.  
It's the right thing to do.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2626    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,01,2010 19:33:21  
**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:** 2627    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private

**Received:** May,01,2010 19:33:26  
**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:** 2628    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,01,2010 19:33:27  
**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:** 2629    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,01,2010 19:33:27  
**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:** 2630    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private

**Received:** May,01,2010 19:33:27

**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:** 2631    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,01,2010 19:33:32

**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:** 2632    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,01,2010 20:03:21

**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:** 2633    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,01,2010 20:03:22  
**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:** 2634    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,01,2010 20:03:22  
**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:** 2635    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** N/A, N/A A  
**Received:** May,01,2010 20:05:24  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** The outer banks is know for it's wind. It's know for the amazing beaches. It's know for the fishing. It's know for being a place of relaxation and fun. I have been coming to the outer banks since I was a young child. My mother has been coming to the outer banks since she was a young girl. My grandfather loved the outer banks. He is part of the outer banks. After he passed away and I went back to the outer banks for a kitesurfing trip. I could feel him there. I believe many other people like my grandfather have a connection to the outer banks like this. Stripping people for enjoying the beaches to the full potential is wrong. Everybody should enjoy them to the full potential. Not to mention the personal aspects of this but how is this going to affect the economy. I know that if the beach are closed to many recreational activities I will not travel to the outer banks. I would rather save my money and travel to another destination. I hope that you take this and the other comments into consideration and make the decision to allow all access to the beaches.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2636    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,01,2010 20:33:26  
**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:** 2637    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,01,2010 20:33:26  
**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.  
darcie stuart 103 Botany Road Greenville, S.C. 29615

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2638    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,01,2010 20:33:26  
**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:** 2639    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,01,2010 20:33:32  
**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:** 2640    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,01,2010 20:33:37  
**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:** 2641    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,01,2010 20:33:37  
**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:** 2642    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** May,01,2010 20:43:40  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** we are fishermen and use or off road trucks to go fishing in the areas that are not able to be reached by everyone by foot and we are the most respectful of all that go off road because we want to continue to have this right and we will inform on people who do not respect the right to do so

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2643    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,01,2010 21:03:27  
**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:** 2644    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,01,2010 21:25:10  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** keep our beaches open. listen to the people for a change

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2645    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,01,2010 21:33:36  
**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.  
Many years ago my family and I visited Cape Hatteras and greatly enjoyed the many birds and the wildlife we saw. For this reason I would support this alternative plan, which would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of 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:** 2646    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,01,2010 21:33:36  
**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:** 2647    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private

**Received:** May,01,2010 22:03:08  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I do not agree - with the NPS recommended proposal represented by Option F. The proposal is to restrictive and doesn't acknowledge the current restrictions have been workable and successful. Bird and turtle populations have been rebounding for over 10 years. The more restrictive boundaries and limitations presented in the NPS preferred solution does not recognize the need for a vibrant livelihood for the residents of the Outer Banks. The limits which all have lived with for the last 2 years seem to have provided an acceptable balance. To be more restrictive ignores the human suffering that will occur with the more prescriptive limitations. As a disabled veteran and former Naval Officer - I have both sever limitations that do not allow me to walk to the shore and a love of the sea that draws me to the ocean. Please lets do something reasonable for the residents and guests - and given the current solution has been proven to be working for both, lets keep it.

**Correspondence ID:** 2648    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,01,2010 22:03:33  
**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:** 2649    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,01,2010 22:03:34  
**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:** 2650    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,01,2010 22:33:42  
**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:** 2651    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,01,2010 22:33:42  
**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:** 2652    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,01,2010 22:33:43  
**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:** 2653    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,01,2010 22:33:43  
**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,

0009555

migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2654    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,01,2010 23:03:53  
**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:** 2655    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,01,2010 23:03:53  
**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:** 2656    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,01,2010 23:03:58  
**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:** 2657    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,01,2010 23:03:59  
**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:** 2658    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,01,2010 23:33:42  
**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:** 2659    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,02,2010 00:03:54  
**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:** 2660    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,02,2010 00:03:54  
**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:** 2661    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,02,2010 00:33:52  
**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:** 2662    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,02,2010 00:33:52  
**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,

0009558

migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2663    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,02,2010 01:03:51  
**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:** 2664    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,02,2010 01:33:53  
**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:** 2665    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,02,2010 02:03:56  
**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,

0009559

migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2666    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,02,2010 03:34:06

**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:** 2667    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,02,2010 03:36:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Keep the beaches open to ORV and increase access. I have been visiting cape lookout now for 5 years and love riding my atvs on the beach.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2668    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** bailey, pam  
**Received:** May,02,2010 05:26:45

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** To Whom It Concerns:  
I need to offer my voice to clearly let it be known that I am profoundly opposed to greater regulations being applied to my home beaches on Hatteras Island, NC.

I see arbitrary, if not capricious, regulations being suggested that have no basis in science or preservation. That being said, I feel the Park Service could be creating some very expensive law suits in the future that could be avoided by rethinking the current pending policies.

All of the bird populations, treaties and laws, are currently being followed. There is no reason to extend the preservation policies.

Extending the Piping Plover buffets is arbitrary. Hatteras Island is the very tip of the their habitat and very few pairs produce chicks in this geographical location. There is no proof or reason to extend the current buffers.

Closing the tips of the island makes no sense as the birds have not been seen there, otherwise the tips of the island would have been closed years ago.

This is Park Service land and Park Service Employees are constantly looking for Piping Plovers, turtles, and migratory birds in order to close beaches. Permanent closure of these areas is arbitrary and capricious.

As a governmental agency, you represent all who use a park and park lands. Excluding people is in direct opposition to your fundamental purpose.

Excluding pets is just a way to perpetrate a mean attitude toward locals and visitors. Pets are leashed and fines are steep.

Driving on the Beach is not proven to upset the beach in any lasting form. The tire tracks evaporate in the wind and weather. There is no science proving that driving on the beach causes and ecological harm to the beach.

I am an environmentalist.

I believe in science and fairness.

Please rethink these policies. If you are not careful, you will ruin many people's lives.

The Hatteras beaches are for people and for wildlife.

Thank you.

Pam Bailey

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2669    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,02,2010 05:34:16

**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:** 2670    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,02,2010 06:04:26  
**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:** 2671    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,02,2010 06:04:26  
**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:** 2672    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,02,2010 06:30:08  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** i feel it is important to keep access to the nc outerbanks beaches accessible especially vehicles. if there are turtles nesting it is ok the close down that area of the beach to traffic but any other animal that is not endangered that is not enough justification to close down the beach. thanks

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2673    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Russell, Betty T  
**Received:** May,02,2010 06:37:47  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate this comment time. We have been coming to Hatteras Island for over 30 years - in 1999 we became property owners on the island. Our first

house was on the beach side in Hatteras village and our current house is on the sound side in Indiantown, Frisco, NC. Our homes were both rentals. We had lots of guests who absolutely loved the area. I have saved all their comments about the area. One of the biggest drawing cards for our rental guests was location and the ability to drive on some of the most awesome beaches in the USA. Many fishermen and women come to Hatteras for that purpose. Even the renters we had on our ocean side house chose to drive on the beach so they could fish from the beach. At least, when we had the beach front rental folks had a beach to walk to - our house on the soundside is a different story. Access to our beaches by pedestrians and ORV is essential to the economy of the entire area. Those visitors and owners who do not have beach side homes or rentals are completely left out of the picture when it comes to beach access if the beaches are closed to ORV. From the time that it was announced that beaches would be closed, we have been getting as much information as possible about the reasons why and generally to keep our friends and renters apprised of what was happening to this National Recreational Seashore.

It all boils down to who has the most influence and available money to make things happen - obviously National Audubon and Defenders of Wildlife have what it takes to make the difference - lots of money and the ability to pick and choose the right time to go before the perfect federal judge. For the local communities to come up with the lawyers and money to be on equal footing with national groups is next to impossible.

We have been driving on the beaches for years and have a huge respect for the local fauna and the wildlife. The birds and fauna are what make Hatteras Island what it is. The birds are special to everyone - especially the Piping Plovers - they are having a hard time surviving even with the help of federal judges, the National Park service, Audubon and Defenders of Wildlife. WHY - It has come to our attention that the fauna where the Plovers like to nest is not the best for their nesting - they like open spaces on the beach to protect them from predators. Obviously the area around the point is grown up with lots of grasses and shrubs - not conducive for this particular birds. When we found out that the natural predators (who have as much of a right to survive and live) were being shot so that these birds might survive + closing the beaches and keeping everything a way is NOT the way that mother nature works. The Plovers are not destined to survive in this area with or without pedestrians or ORVS on the beaches. Another factor that the Park Service can't stop is the weather - The Noreasters and hurricanes that hit this area of the Outer Banks are also natural predators to these birds and their nests.

In conclusion, we do not support any of the choices that have been given to the citizens of the United States regarding use of the beaches on Hatteras Island. We do support information from the Park Service regarding use of the beaches - (currently the information is located on the access road to the beach - it is very hard to read this information when you are driving on the sand and cannot stop to read this important information). The regulations should be posted in a location that is accessible to the driver before driving on the sand. We want to continue to bring our pets to the beach (on a leash) cleaning up after them as we have always done. We want access to enjoy these beautiful, clean beaches that have stayed that way for years. Hatteras is a National Recreational Seashore - a place for everyone to use - those who walk over and those who drive on the beaches. Other than the big holidays - Memorial Day, 4th of July and Labor Day - when all the beaches were open - it was never crowded because there was more room to enjoy the beaches - all of them were open to everyone. Most of Hatteras Island is a wildlife preserve - that's the way it should be, but to take away the Cape Hatteras Recreational Seashore is a crime and an economical disaster to the community and those visitors that come to Hatteras Island.

Thank you for the opportunity to voice our concerns about the future of Hatteras Island and the folks who live and visit there.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2674    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,02,2010 06:54:05

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** As an avid fisherman for over 30 years and as a property owner in Dare County I have always believed that beach access is something that everyone should be able to enjoy. With the growing population beach access is harder to come by these days. The area at Cape Hatteras National Seashore has been a vital plus for the area and business. I support the conservation of any and all sea life and marine animals. However I believe it can be done in a manner that does not destroy an entire village. I fish for recreation; however these good folks on the island depend on the fisherman both commercial and recreational to support their families. I do not support an entire closure of beach access. This will destroy an entire island and many families and their business. I agree with the Dare County decree that request corridors; relocation and proper management. Some common sense must take place and work this issue out to satisfy the concern for marine life but also for the concern for peoples lively hood. If a total closure goes into effect you might as well forget the rebuilding of Oregon Inlet Bridge as the Island will dry up in just a few years as people leave and business goes under.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2675    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** May,02,2010 07:05:36

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** The series of Life Saving Stations (US Life Saving Service) within the Seashore are a symbol of the Cultural/Historic Value of surf zone access. These stations, in addition to rescue of crew & passengers of ships in distress, often served as community centers. These stations pre-date the establishment of the Seashore and co-existed with the park until the 1950's. I believe the DEIS fails to recognize this, or in fact any, Cultural/ Historical Value of surf zone access.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2676    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,02,2010 07:34:31

**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:** 2677    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,02,2010 07:34:32  
**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:** 2678    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,02,2010 08:04:34  
**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:** 2679    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,02,2010 08:04:34  
**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:** 2680    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,02,2010 08:34:39  
**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:** 2681    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,02,2010 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:** 2682    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** May,02,2010 09:28:58  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** The Outer Banks should be open to drive on the beach. My family and I go over at least once a month from March-November. We have a truck with an over head camper, we park on the beach at the water. We take our two kids with us and they love it. What im saying is please keep the Outer Banks open yo drive on the beach.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2683    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,02,2010 09:34:49  
**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:** 2684    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,02,2010 09:34:49  
**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:** 2685    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,02,2010 09:35:05  
**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:** 2686    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,02,2010 09:35:05  
**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:** 2687    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.02.2010 09:35:07  
**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:** 2688    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.02.2010 09:35:23  
**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:** 2689    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.02.2010 09:38:43  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I believe that we must maintain driving access on the national seashores. I also believe that it is possible to protect the wildlife as well. It makes perfect sense to monitor the beaches and have temporary closures where a sea turtle nest is known to exist or endangered birds as well. Permanent closures would be an economic and public relations disaster. If people are not able to get onto the beach to fish, enjoy the ocean, the beauty, etc... then we are not able to enjoy these national parks. National parks are for the people. They need to remain open to the people.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2690    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Martin, Joan E  
**Received:** May.02.2010 09:45:22  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** The United States of America is based on freedom. The freedom the Pilgrims journeyed here for. The freedom the colonists fought Britain for. You can't take the freedom of our beaches away from us now or ever.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2691    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Stahl, James G

**Received:** May,02,2010 09:59:21

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** This comment is to emphasize unjustifiable economic disruption to the beach area involved in this hearing. US citizens will suffer economic harm and loss that will be directly attributable to restricting beach access. Therefore, please carefully guarantee that qualified public vehicles will always be permitted reasonable beach access for recreational water-front activities.

I am a beach enthusiast that is attracted by the ability to drive on the water-edge sand and scout for schools of fish. Like most true outdoor sports men & women, I cherish and adore wildlife while being glad to pay fees for recreational hunting and fishing licenses that fund wildlife management and preservation. There is solid evidence that wildlife management is a successful approach to self-sustaining populations of wildlife, but management programs must be rational and well-balanced with human interests and necessities.

My friends and I have routinely visited the Outer Banks, mainly the Hatteras area, for over thirty years to enjoy surf fishing and duck/geese hunting. Many times we have made four or five trips a year, and we usually bring six to eight in our group. We usually stay four days, but sometimes for a week, to fish and hunt the coastal wildlife. As any reasonably self-regulating person can quickly surmise, there is a financial factor that is added or subtracted when people like me choose to make a trip or skip a trip to the beaches involved in this hearing.

It appears that some people are making irrational demands for unjustified wildlife protection that will involve closing beach access. Such a law or policy will certainly prevent me and my kind from contributing to the local economy, because we will no longer be attracted to the beach for sporting purposes. As you weigh your hearing testimony, please remember that closing the beach to stimulate wildlife will have a tangible negative factor on the local economics, directly attributable to closing beach access.

It was always my understanding that the National Seashore was primarily set aside for all US citizens. There is more among us than just one special interest group.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2692    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,02,2010 10:04:50

**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:** 2693    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,02,2010 10:04:51

**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:** 2694    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,02,2010 10:04:51

**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.

0009567

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2695    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,02,2010 10:21:12  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am concerned individual for the actual state of our coastal region and it's flora and fauna. I have lived on the Outer Banks and on NC's coastal region for the last 40 years and understand everyone's point of view, including those of the locals, the natives, and the visitors of this region. I am an avid surfer and lover of the NC Coast and it's wildlife.  
My recommendations are that private vehicles should not be permitted on any of NC's beaches. In the past years, allowing vehicle access to our beaches has gone way out of control and has caused many problems to our wild life and to the keeping the beaches in a pristine state.  
I believe that anything heavier than a human being's body is not natural to the environment and should not be allowed on natural offroad areas. This includes the beach areas. I do believe that our natural parks are for all Americans and their visitors and should be kept as pristine and beautiful as possible. We should allow access to pedestrians in most areas most of the time of the year, as long as wild life and fauna are not jeopardized.  
Surfing and sports fishing should be allowed most of the time of the year and in most areas as long as it doesn't conflict with wildlife preservation. Heavy fines should be kept for offenders that leave trash and any debris on beaches and in park areas. Dogs should be kept on leashes and their fecis picked up by their owners.  
Hunting should only be allowed on certain species if and when it protects that species from disease and overpopulation. This means that open season would not occur yearly, but only when necessary as determined by wildlife officials.  
Thanks for letting me vent my opinion.  
Sincerely,  
Concerned NC Surfer

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2696    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,02,2010 10:22:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please do not take away the right to drive on the beach from citizens who treat the ocean,beach and wildlife with respect-----punish those who do not!We have been coming to Hatteras Island for 2 to 3 weeks each year for the last 25 yrs. If the beaches are closed there is no reason for us to come and we would be heartbroken.  
ty Larry Dean

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2697    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,02,2010 10:35:13  
**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:** 2698    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,02,2010 10:35:23  
**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:** 2699    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May.02,2010 10:35:28

**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:** 2700    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May.02,2010 10:46:16

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** To Whom it May Concern, Please do not close our beaches. OPEN THE BEACHES TO PUBLIC ACCESS!! The beaches have been the reason why so many people come to the Outer Banks. You will hurt and have hurt several hundred people and their business's by closing these beaches. They have not been able to rent their homes that they use for a business and the local area business's have lost more than 40% of their income because of these closures. I live on sound in Manteo and we run a Pet Sitting business and have seen a dramatic drop in people calling us because they can't afford to go any where due to these closures. Please listen to these comments and re-open the beaches.

I recommend that instead of closing beaches why don't they surround the bird nest or turtle nest with 3 poles and wrap "YELLOW" not gray tape around these poles that say keep out. You could use the police tape. By using yellow tape people will see this so much clearer. Also why don't we take care of our turtles like they do in Florida? Instead of protecting the nest take the eggs and incubate them and release them once they are big enough and it is safe to do so. This way we would not loose one turtle!!

Additionally I do not feel it is fair that every time their is damage to a area that we should loose another 80 feet of beach. Why should the public pay for 1 persons ignorance?? Also how do you know it isn't some environmentalist that is trying to get more area on the beach closed?? Why isn't there an investigation before the beach closure is added to??

PLEASE OPEN THE BEACHES!! We are a resort area!!

Sincerely, Diannalea Knight

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2701    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May.02,2010 10:51:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am writing to you today because my family enjoys recreation in the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area. I support H.R. 718 and S.1557 which would reinstate the National Park Service "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 where recreational access was promised in the enabling legislation.

I'm in the vacation rental bussiness, this is the reason our vacationers come to the Outer Banks year after year! And this is what keeps them coming back year after year. Best beaches and being able to use them as they have always used them.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2702    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,02,2010 11:05:22  
**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:** 2703    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,02,2010 11:05:25

**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:** 2704    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,02,2010 11:05:25

**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:** 2705    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,02,2010 11:35:16  
**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:** 2706    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,02,2010 11:35:18  
**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:** 2707    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,02,2010 11:35:24  
**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:** 2708    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Tolbert, Jon G

**Received:** May,02,2010 11:41:52  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I agree with the Coalition To Preserve Beach Access position statement on the DEIS for the Cape Hatteras National Seashore .Promises and commitments were made more than fifty years ago to the people of the island when the park service acquired the land to open the park to provide free and open access . I feel the law suits have no validity and should be overturned and the filing parties should be held accountable to make all affected parties whole. The SELG and Audibon society have no right to deny access to a National Park for any reason. The Seashore is culturally and historically significant, and access should be protected at all costs.

**Correspondence ID:** 2709    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Egelhoff, Tom  
**Received:** May,02,2010 11:54:42  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Mike Murray, Superintendent Cape Hatteras National Seashore  
Dear Mr. Murray & Park Service Personnel: I have been watching the debate the last few years on ORV planning for Cape Hatteras with increasing dismay. I grew up in southern Virginia spending summer vacations at Cape Hatteras, and still bring my kids back there now 40 years later. The beauty of miles of empty, wild beaches on the island is a special thing that is extremely rare anywhere on the East Coast. The current "Plan F" favored by the Park Service is either a sham or a misunderstood disaster- it appears to protect only ~3 miles of beach for pedestrians, and much of this is narrow, adjacent to roads, motels, etc. Opening this much beach to large motorized vehicles would destroy any chance that I would ever bring my family back to Hatteras for a vacation. I am sure it would have the same effect on thousands of other tourists. There is nothing fun or pleasant about walking or swimming on a beach with ORVs roaring back & forth. I urge the Park Service to put real and meaningful restrictions on ORVs, keeping most or all of the Hatteras beaches free from the noise and habitat destruction ORVs would bring. Sincerely, Tom Egelhoff

**Correspondence ID:** 2710    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,02,2010 11:59:29  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** You are required by NEPA to address cultural impacts of your actions. In fact, given the reception the preferred alternatives are receiving from the local population, many of whom have generations of history on Hatteras Island, it is clear the a Social Impact Assessment should and must be performed. You are ignoring this requirement, I believe, in clear violation of the NEPA.

**Correspondence ID:** 2711    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,02,2010 12:05:19  
**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.  
Dear Sirs, Agian we are faced with trying to balance the wants of man and the needs of nature. We are the protector of the wildlife who play a vital role in the web of life .  
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:** 2712    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,02,2010 13:05:20  
**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 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:** 2713    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,02,2010 13:05:20  
**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:** 2714    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,02,2010 13:05:25  
**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:** 2715    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,02,2010 13:05:25  
**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

0009573

implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2716    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,02,2010 13:05:26  
**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:** 2717    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,02,2010 13:08:50  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** My wife and I first visited the Outer Banks in the early seventies and continued to come back for several years until we had our first child in 1981. We did not return to the area until our three daughters were a bit older and continued to visit Buxton for many years thereafter.  
Our daughters consider those vacations to be the best memories on their childhood -- especially when we purchased a vehicle which allowed us access to The Point and they learned how to cast a fishing rod in the surf.  
We always acted responsibly when traveling to and from our favorite locations and we observed that the vast majority of the people we met were also thoughtful and respecting of the environment.  
We would like to express our opposition to the severe access restrictions to the area being considered and to encourage you to find alternatives that encourage rather than discourage our children to return to their favorite part of the coast.  
Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2718    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Zovistoski, Charlotte K  
**Received:** May,02,2010 13:28:13  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I disagree with the NPS prohibition of pets on the seashore during bird breeding season, including in front of the villages (Pg 136). Pets are easily controlled on leashes. Leash laws and clean-up laws are more than adequate for controlling pets at the seashore. They should be allowed on the beaches year-round as they are often considered to be four legged family members.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2719    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,02,2010 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 do not belong in environmentally sensitive areas. I don't drive my truck in my yard because I want a beautiful lawn, shrubbery, flower beds and vegetable garden. Neither should ORVs have access to sensitive dune and nesting areas. Let them tear up their own back yards!  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2720    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,02,2010 13:41:25  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I disagree with the extensive, inflexible buffers (Pg 121-127) proposed for nesting birds. Closures should be reasonable. Full beach closures are unreasonable and unnecessary. Birds don't nest in the water. Pedestrians should be able to walk the entire seashore and a corridor for pedestrians could easily be provided near the water.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2721    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,02,2010 14:01:40  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As a frequent visitor of the Outer Banks for almost forty years, I believe that vehicles should continue to be allowed beach access, particularly at the point. Personally, I only visited the point by fourwheel vehicle during a couple of summers. Other years my family and I walked the 1 1/2 miles from where we rented, to the point. But whether by foot or vehicle what I consistently witnessed were people enjoying this natural habitat, while respecting it and doing nothing to destroy it. I believe that the natural wildlife and humans can co-exist in this environment as long as some simple precautions are followed. Just as fishermen are restricted by the amount and size of fish they may keep, on land visitors are expected to stay away from nesting areas, watch for signs of turtle nests and mark them, throw back unwanted catches, and take their garbage with them. I personally have observed this kind of respectful behavior from most people that visit these pristine coastlines. I therefore respectfully hope that the final decision will be to continue allowing access to the beaches by vehicles, while rules are enforced. People that follow the rules should not be restricted from these areas.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2722    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,02,2010 14:05:46  
**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:** 2723    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Wasson, Bob L  
**Received:** May,02,2010 14:17:41  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I would like to go on record as being adimently in favor of ORV rights in the Cape Hatteras National RECREATIONAL Seashore. I have enjoyed the Outer Banks for many years. I am now 66 years old with three stints in my heart, and can no longer get to the beach to fish without my four-wheel drive pickup. I cannot believe that organizations from outside our state, and with unscientific data, have been able to impose their will on our judicial system, our government and our Park Service. Please revise your Plan F to give much more beach access, which is our heritage and the Park Service's promise to the people.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2724    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Chapman, Kevin E  
**Received:** May,02,2010 14:26:36  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Opening comment I and my Family would liked to have commented in person to the unfair and illogical proposals in this plan, but like most people who this plan will affect we are not able to attend the public meetings. We are simple people who treasure the time we get to spend each year in the Cape Hatteras Recreational area of which is the correct name as it was when it was created. We hope our opinions will be read and considered as government is "for the people by the people"  
? Routes and Areas ? Alternative F restrictions 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 ? NPS: "Visitor experience could be affected by conflicts between motorized and non-motorized recreation users." (p. vi)Why has NPS never made public a list of reported incidents? o 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) o o NPS: "Because it is not administered by the NPS, the seashore cannot direct the visitor use at Pea Island NWR." (p. 1)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? o o NPS: "Even with resource closures in place, protected species are still at risk [from pedestrians and ORVs]." (p. 210)No Piping Plover deaths have been attributed to ORVs. o ORV violations continue to decrease as signage and education improve. o Pedestrian violations are much more significant than ORV violations. o NPS: "Carrying capacity would be a 'peak use limit' determined for all areas based on the linear feet of beachfront?" (p. xxiv)Why is capacity more restrictive on Bodie Island and Ocracoke than at Cape Point? (p. xxiv)Bodie Island, Ocracoke -260 vehicles per mile o Cape Point ?400 vehicles per mile o o 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) o 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? ?NPS: Shorter Off-Season ORV access on South-facing Villages (p. xix)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)  
? 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." ( p. 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 visitors to the village beaches require the vehicle to be returned to the street, creating unnecessary hardships and risks in the event of emergencies? (p. 58) ? ? Other Why does Alternative F continue to ignore the longstanding need for a soundside access ramp on Bodie Island? (p. 263) ? The relocation Ramp 2 to 0.5 miles south of Coquina Beach is financially irresponsible. This money would be much better spent to enlarge the parking lot and provide pedestrian and handicapped accessible ramps to the beach at Ramp 1 since it will be closed to ORV use to increase the "Pedestrian Only" area. (p. 61)

? Closures Due to Birds ? Restrictive Species Management Areas (p. 468) 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 & ORV corridor thru SMA at Cape Point, South Point ? Coalition: 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 & nesting season (within guidelines) to maintain access. ? ? Limited Pedestrian and ORV Corridors (p. 468) NPS: Only recognized in ML2 managed SMAs ? NPS: SMA management reverts to standard buffers when bird breeding activity first observed ? Coalition: 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. ? ? Inflexible Buffers (p. 468) NPS: ML1 ? 300 meters for all activities for all state listed species ? NPS: ML2 ? buffers vary by species by activity ? Large, Inflexible Buffers (p. 121-127) NPS: buffers (i.e. closures) will be larger than those endorsed by Coalition ? NPS: buffers do not allow for ORV pass-thru only corridors ? Coalition: buffers use breeding / nesting buffer distances to establish ORV pass through only corridors to ensure beach access is always maintained ? Coalition: Piping Plover unfledged chicks buffer should move with the brood as it relocates to reliable food source, not expanded Species Breeding Nesting Buffer Unfledged Chicks ML1 ML2 Coalition ML1 ML2 Coalition Piping Plover 75m 75m 50m 1,000m 1,000m 300m (ped) 200m Wilsons Plover 300m 150m 30m 300m 200m 30m AMOY 300m 150m Flush + 15m 300m 200m Flush + 15m Least Tern 300m 100m 30m 300m 200m 30m Other Colonial Waterbirds 300m 200m 30m 300m 200m 30m

? Pro-Active Adaptive Management (p.124) NPS should aggressively pursue the adaptive management initiatives identified in the DEIS with an object to improve success with both resource protection and visitor access. The initiatives identified include: Vegetation Management ? Habitat Management ? Enhanced Predator Management ? Colonial Waterbird social attraction ? Piping Opportunities to implement less restrictive closures as a result of the above initiatives should be considered more frequently than the 5-year periodic review process identified in the DEIS plover check fledge rate ? Piping plover chick buffer distance ? Pass-through buffers during the incubation period ?

? NPS Resource Management Pedestrian / ORV Closure Policies Address the Least Significant Factor Affecting Nest Survival with Little Chance to Have more than Negligible Impact ? for example: AMOY Nest Failures are Predominately due to Non-human Events Mammalian Predation: 54% ? Storm / Lunar Tides: 29% ? Nest Abandonment: 6% ? Avian Predation: 5% ? Ghost Crab Predation: 3% ? Human Interference: 3% Insignificant Impact ? ? ? NPS does not adequately consider locations neighboring the Recreational Area that are part of the same ecosystem. 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. 500 black skimmer nests reported on Pea Island in 2009

? Night Driving Restrictions Penalize Pedestrian and ORV users (p.125) May 1 ? November 15th ? ? 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 Night 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 ? ? NPS: "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) "Major Adverse" (NPS definition, p.369) events have not occurred at the Recreational Area ? Night Driving Restrictions are Not Necessary 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.

NPS will not Adopt More Proactive Techniques Used at Other East Coast Locations to Encourage Turtle Nesting Success ? WHY ? Captive Rearing (p.86) Routine Nest Relocation (p.86) Hatcheries (p. 87) ? ? ? NPS Inadequately Addresses Environmental Issues More Detrimental to Turtle Recovery Success than ORVs or Pedestrians (p. 392-396) 38.5% of nests had 0% hatchlings due to weather events. (p. 87, p. 219) ? 2009 Loggerhead Recovery Plan calls this catastrophic o False crawl statistics do not support theory that light pollution is a significant problem at the Recreational Area. (p.125, p. 219) o Predator management and nest enclosure practices encourage ghost crabs which are a primary predator of turtle eggs and hatchlings o o North Carolina Wildlife Resource Commission Relocation Guidelines are Inadequate Recreational Area and the State have lost 55% and 60% of Leatherback nests respectively over the past 10 years following these guidelines. o 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.

? 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. ? 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 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.

? Other Areas of Interest ? Pet / Horses Restrictions DEIS: "prohibition of pets in the Seashore during bird breeding season including in front of the villages." (p. 136) = No Pets in public areas ? beaches, campgrounds, soundfront, foot trails, park maintained roads -from March 15 ?July 31 ? The Coalition position allows pets on 6 foot leashes year-round in all areas open to pedestrians or ORVs. ? ? Safety / Administrative / Temporary Closures DEIS guidelines, other than previously mentioned carrying capacity issues, are consistent with the Coalition position statement. ? ? Permits Requirements DEIS guidelines, other than the implementation of fees and how the moneys collected are used, are consistent with the Coalition position statement. ? ? Vehicle Characteristics Requirements / Camping DEIS guidelines are consistent with the Coalition position statement. ? ? Visitor Education The Coalition endorses a thorough Education Program as a way to increase awareness of policies important to the successful accomplishment of both recreational and resource protection objectives.

? Predator Management NPS: Current policy of selective species eradication will continue. ? NPS: Adaptive management initiative may review effectiveness of some policies in the future (p. 124) ? Coalition: NPS should more aggressively consider experiences at other East Coast locations in the development of an overall, integrated predator management policy. ? ? WHY -Is it ok to tamper with nature in some cases but not others? The adaptive management decisions reflected in the DEIS 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. ? NPS: OK to replace South Point wetlands with parking area because beach will be closed to ORVs. ? NPS: OK to relocate Turtle Nests when storms are imminent, but not before (coincidentally the high risk nests are in prime ORV corridors). ? NPS: OK to set aside areas of beach to replant the "extirpated" seabeachamaranth, but not OK to clear vegetation at Cape Point ponds to create more favorable piping plover habitat (outside of the prime ORV corridor). ? NPS: 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). ?

? Other Observations and Questions ? WHY -Was Alternative F attributed to the Advisory Committee? The rules, policies and procedures in Alternative F were not reviewed nor approved by the participants within the Reg?Neg process. The Coalition members that participated in Reg-Neg do not endorse the DEIS plan. ? ? WHY -Is around the clock law enforcement an issue? If access restrictions are due to violations, those responsible should be held accountable. The law-abiding public should not be penalized as they have under the Consent Decree. ? ? WHY -Does the baseline not recognize the de facto plan in place in the years leading up to interim plan, unofficial only because of bureaucratic failures? The cumulative impact of the preferred alternative policies on the visitor experience and the regional economy, when assessed relative to the pre-interim plan period, will be much more adverse than the DEIS acknowledges.

These Comments are in line with the Coalition for Beach Access of which we support whole heartedly!!  
Signed Kevin E. Chapman And family

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2725    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,02,2010 14:35:41

**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:** 2726    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,02,2010 14:35:41

**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.

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2727	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	
<b>Name:</b>	Bitner, Stephen					
<b>Received:</b>	May,02,2010 14:46:47					
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>I would like to request that beach access for all remains open for ORV's and Pedestrians per the Alternative A. To close or, limit beach access to ORV's and Pedestrians would impact the economy of not only Outerbanks but, to North Carolina. I, like many others, travel to the Outerbanks 1 to 2 times per year and stay generally a week at a time. The reason for travel to Outerbanks vs. other beaches in other states is the access to the beach for both ORV and pedestrians. Should the beach access be closed or, limited to ORV's and pedestrians this would have a devastating impact to the economy as I would no longer have a reason to visit the outer banks, and I'm sure others would feel the same. As an avid outdoors person and fisherman I, like many of my fellow outdoorsman, understand the value in protecting the environment and the animals which we live with. If anything, we protect and respect it greater than those who do not understand this relationship. Again, based on the impact study of 2007, I would hope that Alternative A option would be adopted.</p> <p>Sincerely, Steve Bitner</p>					
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2728	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	
<b>Name:</b>	Hamm, William F					
<b>Received:</b>	May,02,2010 14:47:13					
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>My family and I have been annual, or more often, visitors of the "banks" since 1957 and for the last two years had seriously considered a non "banks" vacation for ONE simple reason. Whoever made the decision to close the beach access has to be a fool. For many years the area restricted was absolutely sufficient to maintain adequate breeding grounds for the birds. We decided to give the beach one more chance in the hope that someone, somewhere would come to their senses and open the beach to humans while the birds continued to grow in number.</p>					
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2729	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b> Y
<b>Name:</b>	private					
<b>Received:</b>	May,02,2010 15:01:52					
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	ORV access should be maintained and upheld as a right.					
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2730	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b> Y
<b>Name:</b>	private					
<b>Received:</b>	May,02,2010 15:05:49					
<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>					
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2731	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	
<b>Name:</b>	Bradley, Vernon L					
<b>Received:</b>	May,02,2010 15:37:41					
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>If I understand this entire situation completely then the people who are writing the rules (The NPS) are the same ones that will be approving the rules then will also be the ones who will be enforcing these same rules. Although we often see the police support a law or set of laws I believe it is rare for them to actually write laws and they never have the power to pass a law. Their only job is to enforce. What we have is a conflict of interest. We are asking you, the NPS, to act selflessly, to make Your job harder than it could be. If the police made our laws do you honestly believe that we would be able to freely travel between midnight and dawn or would that right be curtailed for our own protection? So I think we need to remind you that although it makes Your job more difficult because they have to deal with more people in more places this it is what we have come to expect of our civil servants. As has been said many times before this is a recreational park and only people have a need for recreation.</p>					
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2732	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b> Y
<b>Name:</b>	private					
<b>Received:</b>	May,02,2010 15:59:27					
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>Gentlemen, please consider this email a vote for the public's right to access all of the federal parks lands across our great land as many people have died in defense of our country and not its birds and animals. We as people have been given the right of dominion over the air, land and sea by a power greater than any in Washington or Atlanta (or even in Raleigh)... God has spoken and will speak again to our great land and our true citizens (not the Gays and Liberals who wish to usurp our great English Speaking land) and restore a true balance of power upon which we can base our individual</p>					

liberties and joys and work for the common good of all men.

When the birds pay your salary, then you can listen wholeheartedly to them. I say let's save the dinosaurs. Or better yet, let us stop plate tectonics. Or better than that, let us teach the plovers not to nest at the normal high tide line, but better yet to build a nest 6 feet above the mean dune line where any flood high tide will take them away from us. Ignorance is no excuse for political protection. Just look at our congress. Nuff said.

If you have the inkling or nerve, you can read this at one of your meetings. Thanking you in advance for protecting the true lost Amerikan, the lowly tax payer from NC and hoping you will do what is written in your directives, to preserve the beauty and use of the land for all Ameerikins, not just the gays and liberals from the Aw-dee-bone society and other gay pride flag burning fascist groups.

Yours sincerely in the belief of America, the land of the really free and truly brave, now and forever more, and in the belief of a higher power than Washington at any cost,

Captain (USCG Licensed) Charles C. Schoonmaker

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2733	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596		
<b>Name:</b>	beeson, ann						
<b>Received:</b>	May,02,2010 16:07:25						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	i am urging you to keep the beaches open to orv usage. closing the beaches takes away apart of our recreational fishing that north carolinians have enjoyed for generations. closing beaches with also have a negative effect on the economy of the coastal areas. i understand that we need to protect the wildlife, but there has to be a happy medium.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2734	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,02,2010 16:15:47						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	As a thirty year visitor to Cape Hatteras, I fully endorse the position of the Coalition for Beach access position as stated in <a href="http://www.obpa-nc.org/position/statement.pdf">http://www.obpa-nc.org/position/statement.pdf</a> . I thirty years, I have rarely witnessed anything other than conscientious stewardship of the resource by the vast majority beach goers and ORV owners. The proposed restrictions on access and permitted activities in alternatives D and F are onerous and without precedent. They are based on poor data sampling and have limited scientific merit.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2735	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,02,2010 16:26:30						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Now that the "Public" has spoken, it is my hope that the decisions makers will listen and act in favor of open access for the OBX.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2736	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,02,2010 16:27:24						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I would like to ask that beach access not be restricted to our last real fishing grounds in NC. I enjoy our annual trip to Cape Lookout seashore each year for fishing. It's like waiting for Christmas to come. I have never seen anyone disobey the rules while we were there. I do support Stiffer fines for those who are caught breaking the laws. Maybe they should offer a OBX course to people who have never fished the seashore, kind of like a hunter's safety course but for OBX fishing to learn the rules and know what is expected of them while operating a ORV on the beach. Not banning all of the ones who lookout for Cape Lookout. This is a great place that no one wants to see gone, but to ban us from the use of this GREAT PLACE would be a great disappointment to me and my kids who have come to love this place. J P Brock						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2737	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,02,2010 16:35:55						
<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>	2738	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,02,2010 16:35:55						
<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:** 2739    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,02,2010 16:36:05  
**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:** 2740    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,02,2010 16:40:27  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I believe that the DEIS plan is very much over kill to the management of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The park land was taken over by the US Government to be a recreational area to be used by the local people and the people that wish to visit there. It is to be open to everyone to include ORV users. I have surf fished there for the past 30 years and the park has been managed for the good of everyone including taking care of the birds. It was not developed for a few. When I visit there for a month each year I probably spend close to \$2000.00, think what it would do to the local economy if they would lose this income from me and probably several thousand others who would not travel over 750 miles to enjoy this area. Again the plan is very much over kill to not that bad a problem.  
Thank you for letting me comment

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2741    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Livengood, Mike c  
**Received:** May,02,2010 16:45:26  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I feel that if families are stopped from taking there kids to Hatteras and going out on the beach fishing. We have lost something that can never be replaced. If the people who are trying to stop ORV on Hatteras Island would spend the same type of energy on helping feed the hungry children right here in N.C. They would serve a far greater purpose. To stop fishing on Hatteras Island would effect the livelihood of so many families that have depended on fishermen to help feed there families for generations. Going fishing with my family and friends is one of the greatest joy that I have ever experienced.  
Do not stop the joy for so many to please so few.  
Mike Livengood Cape Ten fishing Team Fishing at Hatteras for over 30yrs.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2742    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,02,2010 16:53:41  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** My Father fished these islands with me and his grandkids. He was handicapped and needed to drive on the beaches. I too would like to to enjoy the islands with my 2 grandsons. We have always took care of the beaches and will forward. It would appear that the Gov. has not done such a good job down on the gulf coast. I think we as individuals can better look after the NC coast.  
Keep the beaches open. Keep Gov. and big Oil Companys away.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2743    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** May,02,2010 17:02:46  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** My husbands family frequent Cape Hatteras for family reunions. We enjoy our time spent on the beach and the peaceful nature of those visits. My husband and I feel strongly that our experience would be greatly negatively impacted by ANY expansion of off road vehicle use on these treasured national seashores. We would definitely take this into account when making plans for future family reunions and be less likely to chose Hatteras for the 15 of us to vacation.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2744    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,02,2010 17:05:54  
**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:** 2745    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,02,2010 17:05:58  
**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:** 2746    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** hooks, joe t  
**Received:** May,02,2010 17:08:48  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Do not change rules i have had for past 30 years. We who love to fish for the most part obey all fishing rules and regulations. The laws we have now are enough if enforced.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2747    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,02,2010 17:18:33  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** The DEIS states that the effort it would take to create habitat for plover and other species by clearing vegetation around the Point ponds would be prohibitive, based on other similar experiences. This area serves as cover at least, and likely habitat, for foxes, nutria, opossum, racoon, feral cats and other species the NPS expends great effort to kill as part of predator management. This position is inconsistent.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2748	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	
<b>Name:</b>	O'Neal, Lianne J					
<b>Received:</b>	May.02,2010 17:24:27					
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>"Restricting ORVs from areas of the Seashore could enhance the recreational experience for some and diminish the experience for others. Visitor experience could be affected by conflicts between motorized and non-motorized recreation users." pg. 5, part II</p> <p>I disagree with this statement because it is based on speculation and not facts. In the past decade, only one minor conflict between a stuck vehicle and a pedestrian has been reported. Also, the sections of the seashore that have historically been ORV accessible are rarely used by non-ORV users because it is too long of a walk for most people. Most non-ORV users of the seashore visit sections that are easily accessible to them, in front of the villages and close to parking areas. Most of these sections are already designated as non-ORV areas. Therefore, the potential for conflict between non-ORV and ORV users is minimal.</p>					
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2749	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b> Y
<b>Name:</b>	private					
<b>Received:</b>	May.02,2010 17:35:31					
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>This place is one of the last sanctuaries for wildlife and people along a coast. NPS is one of the last places able to protect such places, not allowing for it to be overrun, destroyed, sound scape ruined, and conflict with both wildlife and people willing to make the effort for this is it 43 miles, of over 3000 miles of coast, and no idea of how much is allowable for ORV. My vote is not ORV us ANYWHERE.</p>					
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2750	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b> Y
<b>Name:</b>	private					
<b>Received:</b>	May.02,2010 17:36:00					
<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> <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>					
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2751	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b> Y
<b>Name:</b>	private					
<b>Received:</b>	May.02,2010 17:37:20					
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>Please allow responsible beach access to ORV's...The tradition of driving on the beach as well as surf-fishing must be upheld.</p> <p>Michael Laughlin, MD</p>					
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2752	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b> Y
<b>Name:</b>	private					
<b>Received:</b>	May.02,2010 18:06:03					
<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:** 2753    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,02,2010 18:06:08  
**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:** 2754    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,02,2010 18:26:58  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** My son is a charter boat captain who goes out of Hatteras. So I am a frequent visitor to the Outer Banks. Through the years I have enjoyed being able to drive out on the beach and fish, picnic, swim, walk, etc. It is a wonderful recreation area that draws many people from the US and other countries to visit, many of them because of the beach access that they enjoy.  
Since this issue came to the forefront and large sections of the beach actually started being closed, many businesses on Hatteras Island have suffered. As a fellow small business owner, my son knows and cares about these people. His business has also been affected. When people come to Hatteras to spend a week, they surf fish, shop, go offshore, and many other activities that support the local economy. If they can't drive out to surf fish and swim, what makes this beach different from others they might choose? Why drive the distance?  
I plead with those making this decision to use some reason and common sense. I understand (heresay) that some natural predators to the shore birds have actually been exterminated (like foxes, etc.). This in itself is not right, as survival of the fittest in nature has always existed. Please find some reasonable compromise where a few shore birds are not put before the human beings who live and visit Hatteras.  
Thank you for your consideration.  
Carole B. Wyncoop

**Correspondence ID:** 2755    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,02,2010 18:36:12  
**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:** 2756    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,02,2010 18:36:12  
**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:** 2757    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

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

**Received:** May,02,2010 18:56:29

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** the current effort to restrict beach access seems based on knee jerk decisions and not on science. Therefore any decision is invalid. I oppose all attempts to close any beach areas. the closing of some of North Carolina beaches is a step toward all north carolina beaches and then other areas nationwide. I do not believe that this is an issue of preveservation, but control. this is not a stewardship of natural resources, but attempts to control natural movement of man. I oppose any and all closure to any public land in this nation. thank you.....

**Correspondence ID:** 2758    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,02,2010 19:06:12

**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:** 2759    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,02,2010 19:06:12

**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.

0009584

**Correspondence ID:** 2760    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Lucas, Jeffrey C  
**Received:** May,02,2010 19:20:30  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Hatteras brings kiteboarders from all over the country to the NC shore. It has the most consistent wind on the East coast, and I would hate for that to be stripped from the public. I have personally had some of my most memorable days of riding there, and would love to add to the list. It means a lot to kites all over the country. Please take this into consideration. Thanks so much for your time.  
Steady winds,  
Jeff Lucas

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2761    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,02,2010 19:36:34  
**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:** 2762    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,02,2010 19:36:34  
**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:** 2763    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,02,2010 19:36:34  
**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,

0009585

migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2764    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,02,2010 19:46:20

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** To close the beaches on the Outer Banks for some birds is a big mistake!! There are so many birds on Hatteras Island now it is unbelievable. You will destroy what the Island is all about. It's why people come to the outer banks to be able to drive on the beaches & fish & enjoy nature & the birds. There is room for everyone with out closing the beaches at any time of the year. It will kill the economy.. The economy is bad enough as it is. Closing the beaches will destroy so many people & there businesses all for a few birds. Whoever is making this decision must not have ever been to Hatteras Island & drove on the beaches. There are so many birds year round is is unbelievable.. There is room for all !! I OPPOSE closing the beaches on the Outer Banks. BIG MISTAKE !! I have been coming to the Outer Banks (Hatteras) for over 35 years. Please do NOT close the beaches !! Sincerely, Lisa Pate

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2765    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Naylor, David W  
**Received:** May,02,2010 19:58:55

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please keep the beach open to ORV vehicles. I believe the economic impact to this area is greatly enhanced and brings tourist and fisherman from across the state to this area. I believe there are compromises on both all sides that can be made to ensure that the beaches stay open to the public. I do understand the impacts to wildlife, in particular the sea turtles and the Plover. However, those that act sensible (which is more than the majority) can and have minimized their impacts voluntarily. Again, I am in support of keeping the beaches open for ORV. Thank You.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2766    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,02,2010 20:06:28

**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:** 2767    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,02,2010 20:06:31

**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

0009586

implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2768    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,02,2010 20:23:52  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I support ORV use on the beaches. Let the common people enjoy our nations beauty also. Not just the select few. It belongs to us.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2769    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,02,2010 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 3 principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met.  
Thank you for your time and for your attention to this important matter.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2770    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,02,2010 20:36:54  
**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:** 2771    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,02,2010 20:36:54  
**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:** 2772    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,02,2010 20:36:54  
**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:** 2773    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,02,2010 21:07:01  
**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:** 2774    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,02,2010 21:07:01  
**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 extremely important to me. It should be noted that Cape Hatteras is a national treasure, not just a playground for "locals."  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be

implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2775    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,02,2010 21:36:58  
**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:** 2776    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,02,2010 21:37:04  
**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:** 2777    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,02,2010 22:06:59  
**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:** 2778    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,02,2010 22:07:13  
**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:** 2779    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,02,2010 22:37:04  
**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.  
PLEASE PROTECT GODS CREATION.....This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2780    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,02,2010 23:37:21  
**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:** 2781    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,03,2010 00:07:25  
**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:** 2782    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,03,2010 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.  
Finally, we are concerned that our country's first National Seashore, the Cape Hatteras National Seashore on North Carolina's Outer Banks, will be protective of essential nesting areas for rare birds such as least terns and piping plovers, and also endangered sea turtles. It appears that mostly unregulated ORV use on the beaches has resulted in significant decreases in wildlife populations, and has made the Seashore a non-serene place for nature lovers like us to enjoy the beaches.  
Here in Oregon we happily do have regulated areas for ORVs. Our snowy plover, which has been a threatened species, is even protected from people and dogs during its nesting season! People who live on and visit our Pacific Coast areas are taught not to disturb, but just to enjoy, the wildlife.  
We hope that the final draft of the Environmental Impact Statement for Cape Hatteras will be a new science-based management plan and will guarantee space and protection for wildlife and those who love it. People who enjoy ORVs should have their own areas so that all can enjoy this seashore 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:** 2783    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,03,2010 02:07:52  
**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:** 2784    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.03.2010 02:23:51  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Hello,

I am writing you to insist that any beach closures do not happen at all in the Cape Hatteras National Seashore. I have been going to this sea shore since I was a child for nearly 40 years now.

Yes the human use has increased but I have also been going to the George Washington Forrest for just as long and the same thing is happening there. what do you expect the population is increasing.

I will say one thing about the increase in human use, both locations are in BETTER SHAPE! now then just a decade or so ago. There is more civic groups fighting to keep the beaches and forests clean.

I find it amazing the amount of uproar and the demand of thousands if not millions of citizen to leave the beaches open. It blows my mind that this is an issue at all. WE own that beach and we demand it be open... end of argument. Tell the special interest groups to "pound sand"

I will not return to OBX if all I can do is look at a couple of light houses. I will not rent any more homes, I will not purchase thousands of dollars per summer in food and gasoline. I will not go to surf fishing tournaments every spring and fall. I will not sneak away for a weekend with my wife in the winter and stay in hotels and eat in local dinners. Most importantly, I will not look at the rangers or the National Park Service they represent with any respect.

I will insist funding be cut since there is no need for all of the rangers to be employed to patrol the closed beaches.

Last year due to all of the closures, I decided to make a trip to Cape Lookout National Seashore, Portsmouth Island. I insist you take the offensive and head off any possible issues that may arise due to the special interests groups in this sea shore.

I strongly encourage you all to listen to the people, and not some money hungry lawyers.

Chris Detmer

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2785    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.03.2010 02:38:05  
**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:** 2786    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.03.2010 02:38:05  
**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

## 0009592

are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

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

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

When I was 9 years old I witnessed a mother sea turtle laying her eggs in the sand. It was a magical sight and I wish that many more turtles will have the protection to lay their eggs just as I saw that turtle do.

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2787	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,03,2010 02:58:20						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	PLEASE provide as much ORV access as possible. Thank you very much.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2788	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,03,2010 04:27:48						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	i am for orv						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2789	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,03,2010 05:37:54						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I support ORV use in our National Parks.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2790	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,03,2010 05:43:23						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I just bought my retirement home last month in Colington Harbor because i enjoy the many public beach access areas. Please do not change this benefit to enjoy the beautiful environment of the OBX.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2791	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596		
<b>Name:</b>	MITCHUM, LANIER L						
<b>Received:</b>	May,03,2010 05:47:12						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	WE HAVE BEEN DRIVING ON SOUTH CORE BANKS ALL MY LIFE . FOR FAMILY VACATIONS AND FISHING SHELLING . I RESPECT THE RULES OF DRIVING ON THIS BEACH AND TRY TO MAKE SURE ALL OTHER DO ALSO . WE DRIVE WHERE THE PARKSERVICE HAS MARKED THE ROADS AND PATHS I RESPECT THE FACT WE STILL CAN ENJOY THE ISLAND WE WAY WE HAVE ALWAYS DONE FOR OVER 40YRS .I KNOW THERE IS ALOT OF FOLKS THAT WANT TO BAN DRIVING ON THE BEACHES . IF THEY DON'T WANT TO SEE TRUCKS AND RV ON THE BEACH . THEY CAN GO TO ONE OF THE PARKS THAT DON'T ALLOW DRIVING . WE HAVE LIVED WITH THE BIRDS AND TURTLES JUST FINE . I DON'T THINK A TRUCK DRIVING ON THE BEACH HURTS ANY WILDLIFE OVER THERE AS LONG AS WE DRIVE WHERE THE PARK SERVICE TELL US TO .						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2792	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,03,2010 05:47:29						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	This is another attempt by the Liberal Elite to force humanity off the page. They want everything left pristine without human lifeforms, but the Elitest still have the opportunity to visit. Humans are part of nature and as stated in the bible, the rest of nature was put there for our benefit, health and welfare. Don't ruin the economy of the OBX all in the name of a bird. State your true cause and quit hiding behind the Piping Plover. Then leave our beaches open.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2793	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596		
<b>Name:</b>	Woodroof, Steve K						
<b>Received:</b>	May,03,2010 05:47:47						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	We need to keep the beaches open to the fisherman and other....I think we can work out an agreement to work with the parks so we can all enjoy the beach...I have made the trip to Hatteras with my famile for several years now ..to fish and play with my grandchildren....but if ther will be no beaches open then I will spend my money somewhere else....I will be down at the end of the month...I hope we are able to get in the beach...or this will be the last time you will se me at hatteras.. please try to work something ou for the future...						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2794	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596		
<b>Name:</b>	N/A, N/A						
<b>Received:</b>	May,03,2010 06:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I am in favor of the cotinued use of off road vehicles on Hatteras beaches.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2795	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,03,2010 06:08:29						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	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 opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

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

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

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

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2796    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,03,2010 06:15:42  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I believe the National Park System was created to allow public access to prime recreation areas. Wildlife should be protected, but it is inconsistent with the creation of the park system to place wildlife conservation above public access. The vast majority of destruction to wildlife comes from catastrophic events such as the gulf oil spill or major hurricanes, yet the focus of conservation time and money seems to be on the activities which create the least destruction and causes the greatest upset to economic and recreational activities.  
Why was the time invested in this meaningless project not directed towards preparation for and prevention of this massive oil spill in the Gulf that will surely be carried by the Gulf Stream to our coast? The park service can adequately manage access to the park and those responsible for this publicity stunt should be admonished for directing resources away from where they are truly needed.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2797    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Genova, James C  
**Received:** May,03,2010 06:42:13  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am a long-time user of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore. I spend at least a week there every year, in addition to weekend trips. I do this to enjoy some fishing and relaxation. I drive my vehicle, responsibly, on the beach in order to access these fishing spots. I am not alone when I say that I am vigilant about observing and reporting any behavior that is inappropriate to the Rangers, or police. Without the public presence on the beaches, those who disregard the rules will run rampant. We all know that there is not enough resources to completely monitor the beaches without the assistance of the responsible public. Please do not limit our access to our beaches.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2798    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,03,2010 06:55:33  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am in support of keeping our National Seashore parks the way they were designed. Myself and my children enjoy traveling to Cape Lookout and using the beaches. I want to keep driving on the beach legal so that I can share with my children outdoor activities and show them an alternative to the things some children do.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2799    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,03,2010 06:58:39  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I support traditional vehicular access to Cape Hatteras National Seashore beaches. Continued access was guaranteed upon the formation of the National Seashore, and any denial and/or substantial limitations thereon is a violation of the federal government's compact with the American public, who are the true owners of these lands.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2800    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,03,2010 07:08:38  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As a long time visitor to the Outer Banks Region and avid outdoorsman, I believe the politically motivated restrictions currently in use and the proposed restrictions are overly protective and unreasonable. I have observed the nesting and breeding habits of many species in many areas of the country, including the Outer Banks, and find the proposed restrictions ridiculous and almost comical. There is no reasonable explanation for these restrictions based on science or natural observation.  
At a minimum ORV access corridors should be maintained to all area of recreation during the entire nesting and breeding season. Buffers of 100 feet for endangered and non-endangered species is more than adequate to safely protect the hatchlings. Nest relocation for sea turtles is commonly and successfully used in many other areas of the east coast, why isn't it considered here?  
As an outdoorsman, hunter and trapper I have observed the destruction caused by a single predator. One wild animal can and will cause more destruction than any number of educated humans. I believe an intensive predator management plan and the education of the public would have a more positive impact on species recovery than the current restriction plan.  
Thank you Larry Ferguson

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2801    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,03,2010 07:08:39

**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:** 2802    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May.03.2010 07:08:45

**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.

I think we all know that many of the human species care nothing for our natural resources. A commitment from more caring and considerate humans to protect all of the beauty we have been given is paramount to any recreational pleasures.

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

**Correspondence ID:** 2803    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May.03.2010 07:38:04

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I would like ORV use on the Outerbanks to continue in the future. I have been going to both Cape Hatteras as well as other portions of the Outerbanks for over 25 years and consider this place "paradise found". I believe the ability to navigate these beaches by vehicle allow for more enjoyment and exploration of the this majestic place. We always try to leave things a little better than we found it. My desire is for my now 4year old son to be able to access and drive and fish the same beaches the way his father has. Please consider this my official request to keep the beaches open for ORV use with as little restrictions as possible.

**Correspondence ID:** 2804    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May.03.2010 07:38:55

**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:** 2805    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,03,2010 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 a frequent visitor to North Carolina and to Cape Hatteras. I spend my tourist dollars in this area. (I am also a strong supporter of the National Parks and National Seashores.) The reason I do so is because of the unique natural beauty and wildlife in this area. I strongly believe in the points listed below. ORVs can be operated in many areas where the damage from their use is not so great. Most visitors to this area do not come to see ORVs. I strongly believe their use in such areas should be limited.  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year 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. A plan must include clear goals and milestones 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:** 2806    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,03,2010 07:39:01  
**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:** 2807    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Estes, Jerry G  
**Received:** May,03,2010 07:40:40  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** My wife and I own property in Rodanthe, visit the Outer Banks often and always stay in the southern villages (Rodanthe, Salvo, Avon, etc) because the area offers miles of beaches to explore. We have been very proud that the National Park Service controls so much of the area, making the beaches accessible to individuals, unlike so many beach areas where private ownership has effectively limited or prohibited access to the shore. Unfortunately, NPS now appears ready to limit individual access to Outer Banks beaches, making the seashore experience little different from that in areas swallowed up by private development. Not only will that discourage my wife and me from visiting the area, but will make the area less attractive to all other visitors. That action, if taken, not only lessens the value of the national seashore to the public, but lessens the importance of the National Park Service whose mission is to protect unique natural areas as a trust for the American people.  
I believe most people that visit national parks and seashores do so because they appreciate the natural environment especially to experience its birds, animals, reptiles, and other creatures and so want to protect them and leave them as undisturbed as possible. If people are educated about how to protect wildlife and habitat, most of them will be proud to act as good stewards. However, if people are prohibited from accessing their publicly owned areas, why should they wish their government to acquire additional public lands but, instead, insist that their government to sell existing lands for private development and dismantle the NPS?

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2808    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,03,2010 07:44:03  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** There has to be a happy medium between both the bird watchers and those that love having the ROV access. Many good waves roll in on sand bars that are not accessible by paved roads. People come from the world over to ride these waves and fish from the shore's. Maybe temporary closure during the nesting period but then opening back up once the chicks are old enough. At that time allow only foot traffic through the area which would not disturb the nesting. Fine those caught harrassing the birds and there nests and for those who dont break the rules allow them to fish in the area as well as ride some of the waves. There must be compromise!!

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2809	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May.03.2010 07:46:42						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	As a long time visitor and rental property owner, I feel strongly that beach closures have a tremendous negative impact on the Outer Banks region. Many of the visitors choose this area because of vehicular access to the beaches at Oregon Inlet and Ocracoke. Surf fishermen in particular, but also families with small children, use these areas attractive for recreation. The local economy depends heavily on these tourists, and losing them would be devastating.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2810	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May.03.2010 07:48:15						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	As a long time visitor and rental property owner, I feel strongly that beach closures have a tremendous negative impact on the Outer Banks region. Many of the visitors choose this area because of vehicular access to the beaches at Oregon Inlet and Ocracoke. Surf fishermen in particular, but also families with small children, use these areas attractive for recreation. The local economy depends heavily on these tourists, and losing them would be devastating.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2811	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May.03.2010 07:49:25						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	whatever dismal plan that NPS chooses to adopt, I do very much wish to see that it still allows for dogs, on leash, to be allowed on our beaches. We've been going to the Outer Banks for many years and our yellow lab always accompanies us when we go out shelling. He never bothers anyone and it is a great joy to have him with us. In all the years we've been there we've never had a problem with people and their pets on the beach.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2812	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	Ritter, Nicole						
<b>Received:</b>	May.03.2010 07:58:15						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	The beaches are a lifeline to Hatteras Island and all who live there. The beaches need to remain open! Shutting down the beaches would be devastating for all who live there and visit there.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2813	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	Brugh, LeAnne						
<b>Received:</b>	May.03.2010 07:59:33						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I support open and accessible beaches.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2814	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May.03.2010 08:09:21						
<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>						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2815	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May.03.2010 08:09:23						
<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</li> </ul>						

least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

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

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

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

**Correspondence ID:** 2816    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,03,2010 08:09:26  
**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:** 2817    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,03,2010 08:09:28  
**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:** 2818    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,03,2010 08:09:28  
**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:** 2819    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,03,2010 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. A little thing to do to save a lot. Wildlife needs our help more than ever. We can not keep throwing wildlife aside for pleasure seeking, there must be a balance - we must not forget this is their home and they have been here longer than us. These areas are vital to their existence. Curtailing use of ORV's will not endanger our existence.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2820    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,03,2010 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. In my experience, ORV and ATV's are used improperly by many, disrupt wildlife and all of us who use beaches and national parkes to get away from the sound and mess of mechanical vehicals whether they be automobiles, lawn mowers, construction vehicals, ATVs or ORVs.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2821    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,03,2010 08:13:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please keep the beaches open where possible. It is not resonable to close miles of beaches for nesting pairs that just cannot physically cover that much terrain. Conservation and recreation do not have to be mutually exclusive.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2822    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private

**Received:** May,03,2010 08:19:01  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Closing the beaches on Hatteras Island (Rodanthe down to Okracoke) would devastate the local economies, the local residents, and vacationers. I can not imagine not being able to take my children to the place where I married their mother. Being able to visit and walk on the beach to show my future children where our family started is important to me and my wife. How can we do that if the beaches are closed to pedestrian walking?! My family and I have been visiting the Outer Banks for sixteen years. Every year we visit we are extremely conscious of the native wildlife. We pick up trash we see (which is not much), we stay clear of turtle nest, and we catch and release most of the fish we catch from the shore. There is no sense in closing down beaches and hurting the local economy because of a few "bad apples". I have learned from my father, like he learned from his and I will pass on to my children, the importance of living side-by-side with Mother Nature and respecting the beaches, oceans, and wildlife. I do acknowledge the fact people want to help save the birds that inhabit the Outer Bank islands. There are better ways to help than to close down the beaches. I believe human beings account for only 3% of the damage done to the birds nesting areas. The other 97% belongs to high tides and predators. Is the next step in saving these nesting areas to build huge walls to stop the high tides? Or perhaps hire sharpshooters to exterminate all predators of the islands birds? Nonsense! Thank you for your time in listening to my argument. Please, keep the Outer Banks beaches open for this generation and future generations. God Bless America.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2823    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,03,2010 08:24:18  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** many of the aspects of the proposed beach closure do not seem to include common sense views to include both socioeconomic and wildlife protection. large beach closures for animals not considered endangered and not including islands on sound uninhabited for counting of species seems to be excessive. with natural predators being the number one cause of casualties, closing the beaches will only increase the number of predators. the number one concern should be the people who depend on open beaches for their businesses. with economy in a terrible state, the effects to people seem to be ignored. i would ask that more nonbiased comprehensive studies be done before such restrictive measures are put into effect.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2824    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,03,2010 08:31:33  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Let every one keep driving on the beach. KEEP THE BEACHES OPEN TO ORV!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2825    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,03,2010 08:32:33  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am in favor of continued ORV use on the Hatteras Beaches.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2826    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,03,2010 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.  
If we put our money where our mouth is we should be protecting wildlife and teaching those who would disrupt its critical life cycles what they are doing and why it is important to all of us and future generations to serve Nature rather than to use it for profit or personal gain. The world has been a great place to live for a long time and now we are seeing such overuse and destruction of all that is provided that we are being threatened ourselves. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2827    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,03,2010 08:39:50  
**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:** 2828    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.03.2010 08:39:52  
**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:** 2829    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.03.2010 08:39:54  
**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:** 2830    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.03.2010 08:41:16  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please do not take my privilege to operate a vehicle on the beach. I visit the coast 15-20 times each year with my Family to enjoy God's gift to us. My parents have owned property near Surf City for more than 30 years but could never afford property that gives them direct access to the beach. Town ordinances and rules provide very limited access via, PBA's except for the rich and famous. For this reason, my family and I must travel more northward to again, enjoy what God has given us. I admire the National Park Service for protecting and preserving our resource. However lately, it seems that the restrictions are meant to keep me out. In all my visits to the coast, I have never mis-treated or upset the environment with my vehicle. Last year alone, I logged a hundred miles or so of beach driving while fishing, camping and exploring. Now that my Parents are up in age and handicaped, the only way they can spend time on the beach is with me in an ORV. Please Help!!!  
Respectfully, Mark

**Correspondence ID:** 2831    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

0009601

**Name:** Venable, Wayne  
**Received:** May,03,2010 08:51:11  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I believe the best alternative to this situation is to return the seashore back to the pre Consent Decree status. The Park Service was doing a good job maintaining closures and the public may not have liked some of them, but they were willing to work with the NPS. After the closures began, I noticed the the bird numbers did not increase, they actually decreased in many cases. The lack of humans on the beach have increased the predation even though hundreds of predators have been eliminated. Something is wrong with this picture, killing animals to save a couple birds. This can and will have drastic consequences one day I believe. I have no problem giving the birds and turtles room to breed but 1000m enclosures effect beach travel and eventually will lead to economic disaster in the local economy , they are by far too large. Most places I have been to have 200m closures around the nests and even some have no closures, just fencing ie: Fort Fisher. The judge was so wrong by allowing this to happen. I have been coming to Hatteras Island for the better part of 20 yrs. If I have to deal with these kind of closures and rules from DOW, Audobon and the lawyers from SELC, I will take my money elsewhere, hopefully before they get there.  
Thank You and God Bless the USA  
Wayne Venable

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2832    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Schwarz, Richard  
**Received:** May,03,2010 08:53:45  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** This proposal is a huge mistake. Opening up nearly all the beaches to ORV traffic will seriously undermine the fragile environment of Hatteras Island. I am a frequent visitor to Cape Hatteras, Buxton, and Frisco and know the area well. Pedestrian traffic should be favored over all else, not a bunch of rumbling, polluting, environmentally-unfriendly vehicles. Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2833    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,03,2010 09:06:48  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Hi, I just purchase a house in Buxton,NC last year. I did it to be close to & to use the beach. I do not mind sharing the beach with birds and turtles. However I do mind that they have more rights than I. I pay the taxes that provide for these parks & I should be able to use the beach & drive on it day or night. thanks, Gregory Watson

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2834    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,03,2010 09:10:07  
**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:** 2835    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,03,2010 09:10:17  
**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:** 2836    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.03.2010 09:10:26  
**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:** 2837    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Hooper, Jennifer L  
**Received:** May.03.2010 09:15:29  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am dumbfounded at the prospect of the closures on the national seashore beaches. The more I hear, the more I fume! My husband, like his family before him, were born and raised on this island. Much of their land was "taken" by the park service with a promise to continue public access to these beaches.  
Now, for a bird that is not native to this area miles of beaches are being closed. This is directly taking food off of my plate for my family and me. Fishing is not only recreation, but it is food for my family. This is a direct hit to me.  
As an indirect hit to me, I work in the vacation rental business. The closures have affected the tourist industry for Hatteras Island, which has in turn affects the tax dollars collected for the county, state and government. - a direct hit.....for everyone. How will you continue to pay your park rangers when the tourism dollars are depleted?  
The solution to this dilemma is EDUCATION!!! Just like someone getting a driver's license they have to be educated as to the rules of the road. If they violate the rules of the road, they are fined, or they can lose their PRIVILEGE to drive on the roads.  
This is the answer to the beach access and driving on the beaches?. EDUCATION!! Issue a driving permit for the beaches after one completes a class or written test and receive the proper endorsement to show they have completed the proper education to drive or access the beach and how to work with nature and to promote good beach driving habits and responsibility. Then if someone violates the laws and rules of beach driving their PRIVILEGE is revoked.  
COMMUNICATION of the concerns, EDUCATION of the general public, and the PRIVILEGE of driving on the beach with your family and pets is a REWARD. As with driving on the roads, that privilege can and should be revoked when one violates the PRIVILEGE.  
Nature will find the safest place to raise their young. The large areas of the National Wildlife Refuge are for NATURE - the NPS and their promise to keep the beaches accessible is for the people as it has been and should remain.  
Education and communication is how we work together for the good of all and will help us to all meet in the middle.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2838    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.03.2010 09:20:45  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I support orv access by responsible law abiding folks.I also support the reasonable regulations to protect wildlife that does not stop access to the water to fish . Thank you

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2839    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.03.2010 09:40:19  
**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.

0009603

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2840    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,03,2010 09:40:29  
**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:** 2841    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,03,2010 09:57:06  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear NPS, I never dreamed that access to the Cape Hatters National Seashore could be so restricted in such a short time by such a small group of environmentalists. On the island of Hatteras the futures of the fishing and tourism industries are at stake. I know you've heard every argument. If this can be done to the people of Hatters, it can certainly and probably more easily be done to the Core Banks islands. It's easy to see that a complete ban on ORV access is the ultimate goal in all the Seashore islands. Incrementalism is the method of the suing groups that hope to limit our access. Is this the way it's going to be, eventually no ORV access? In my opinion there aren't enough people driving at night on Hatteras or Core Banks beaches to affect turtle movements. In the case of Core Banks, it's not an easy place to get to, and the people who visit there love it and respect it. We also love our rights as American citizens TO respectfully access these islands by vehicle. I know you've heard it all but please don't limit our access further by restricting night time driving. It will only lead to more encroachment on our ability to access by vehicle. My suggestion is to make no more limits restricting vehicular access. Thank you. Alan McCurdy, Greensboro, NC

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2842    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,03,2010 10:10:32  
**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:** 2843    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Cavins, John F  
**Received:** May,03,2010 10:11:40  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am at a loss for words to describe my feelings about this Draft plan/EIS but I will try. It appears that the National Park Service has already decided

which alternative it wants and is applying for a rubber stamp approval. How about an alternative that returns the Seashore to the historic use it had when it was formed? This land was donated with the understanding that it would be used for recreation, not as a bird sanctuary. The buffer sizes used in the alternatives have no scientific justification and are being used as a punitive measure to force more and more anglers to simply give up and go somewhere else to fish. This has to stop here and now. We cannot continue to close land for birds that are thriving in other areas and are not even endangered. The practice of using anecdotal evidence to support junk science cannot continue to guide the National Park Service in their decisions regarding the use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area. Any decisions made should exclude evidence that has not been submitted for peer review. This Seashore was set aside for the enjoyment of the people and not for exclusive use by birds. I do not support any alternative that would keep Americans from enjoying any of the recreational uses of the Seashore

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2844	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,03,2010 10:17:15						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Am 42 years old, have been going to Portsmouth for 40 years. My boy is 4 and has been going for 2 years. There is a special breed of people who go to the CLNP for vacations. Yes, I fish, but our trips to PI arent about fishing. They are about enjoying time with family and friends, about looking up and down a beach and seeing pristening sand, they are about looking out in the sky at night and seeing nothing but stars. I don't have to describe to my son about what PI was like when I was a boy. Just look at it today and minus a junkyard, that is what you got. (Me and my cousins did stay amused for hours climbing through old rusy school buses and other stuff.) Parents probably weren't too pleased about that, so don't tell them:). Point being, the people who use this place, drive the beach on trucks and four wheelers are the very same people who care for it the most. I only hope my grand son can one day drive his truck down this beach and experience the magic of PI. Thanks, Michael Lashley						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2845	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,03,2010 10:18:51						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please help us save our beaches AND our economy. It is a struggle to keep things afloat in this global downturn, but Hatteras Island has struggled with it for much longer then most. Closing our beaches has had a direct effect on the livelihood of many people. Please do the right thing for us all.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2846	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596		
<b>Name:</b>	Slingluff, David						
<b>Received:</b>	May,03,2010 10:20:29						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I have been visiting the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area (CHNSR) during both Spring and Fall seasons since 1983 while following my passion for surf fishing. I fell in love with the area and the culture, which supports ORV beach access to Cape Point, Hatteras Inlet, and Ocracoke's "South Point" on my very first trip. As an outdoorsman, I have a great respect for nature and while visiting the park I am always working to help maintain the resource area by clearing trash of all kinds that washes ashore with the continuous winds, tides, and storms. I do my best to keep up with the current issues within the park and help to educate others who may not be aware of things like pollution, or other activities may have impacts on the resource and wildlife. As a visitor, I spend my money at the local hotels, restaurants, and shops to support the local economy. I am saddened to say that I have not been able to visit the place I love for the past two years due in part to economic challenges, other priorities, but mostly due to the beach restrictions imposed by the 'consent decree'. The consent decree has made it almost impossible for me to validate spending my time and my money on the Outer Banks when ORV access is always in jeopardy. I believe the National Park Service should implement an ORV plan that protects and preserves, but does not prohibit. Every effort Should be made to maintain and allow ORV access to the areas listed above as they represent the prime fishing areas visited. Without access to these areas, it is hard to justify trip to CHNSR. The major flaws I see with the consent decree and the Park Service's preferred Alternative F as identified in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). Buffers: the current 1000 meter buffer provide for nesting of Piping Plover's is grossly oversized. No peer-reviewed science supports a requirement for a buffer of this size. There is scientific evidence to support a buffer of 200 meters. Buffers for American Oyster Catcher's, Least Tern's and Colonial Water Birds should be maintained at 30 meters, not 300 meters as this is oversized as well. Non-Endangered Birds: Birds that are NOT on the endangered species list should NOT be given the same protections as required by the ESA for birds on the endangered species list. This is NOT fair to the park visitors, a bit of common sense is required here. Suggestions/Request for access: 1 - Use corridors to maintain ORV access; protect and preserve ? do not prohibit a. Using the beach adjacent to the ocean is optimal ? birds are nesting in the dunes b. Use of inter-dunal roads can be very effective in maintaining open ORV access while providing resource protection 2 - Use appropriate buffers 3 - Use PEER-reviewed science to establish buffer sizes This is my National Park and I plan to use, respect, and protect park resources for many years to come. The park plan that is ultimately implemented will determine my ability to use and enjoy the resource. I am respectfully asking that the Park Service do everything within its power to ensure maximum ORV access is maintained while providing protection and preservation for park resources and wildlife within the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area. Regards, David Slingluff						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2847	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596		
<b>Name:</b>	Petti, Glenn D						
<b>Received:</b>	May,03,2010 10:20:29						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	We has United States citizens should have the right to use what is rightfully ours. 99.9% of all people that use our great beaches here in North Carolina take care of what god has given us. Yes there are a few dummies out there but as with anything in life there is always one or two bad apples in the basket. Please do not take our right to have ORV and access to the beaches. I want my kids and their kids to see what god has given us to use and enjoy wether you fish or just relax and enjoy life. Concerned Citizen of North Carolina, Glenn Petti						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2848	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,03,2010 10:26:33						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						

**Correspondence:** I am not sure WHY it's so hard to understand that there is PLENTY of beach for everyone, animal & man ! Those birds/turtles were down on those beaches LONG before man and they have survived and continue if people would not interfere . By closing off public access to the beaches in Hatteras will totally destroy Dare County who depends on our tourism dollars to survive. I have had a place in Buxton for almost 9 years now and I, like MANY, MANY others will sell and not return if we are unable to drive on the beach and enjoy the surf fishing and beautiful beaches. Does the Park Service not understand that they TOO would be without jobs ? I live in Va Beach and travel three hours every other weekend in the summers and at least once monthly in the winter to enjoy the beauty of your beaches. I hope you will not ruin many lives and enjoyment all over a big POWER STRUGGLE you all seem to want to exercise. Shame on YOU !

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2849    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Budzik, Marcin  
**Received:** May.03,2010 10:33:34  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** In your consideration of the National Park Service Proposed Rules for Beach Access in Cape Hatteras, please do not ban beach access to recreational use, especially to sports like windsurfing or kite-surfing. I visited this area twice for vacation and was able to enjoy the natural beauty of the wildlife while at the same time taking advantage of the area's close to perfect windsurfing and kite-surfing conditions. While I understand and support the need to protect the wildlife and our national sea shore, the proposed actions seem to be unjustly targeting visitors whose actions have nothing to do with negatively affecting the wildlife in this area.  
Sincerely, Marcin Budzik

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2850    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Shafer, Joe  
**Received:** May.03,2010 10:33:54  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I and my family have been using the Cape for many years. As you can see by our address we travel a great distance to enjoy "paradise". So often, we hear only of the people who violate the law and usually give more weight to their numbers than to those who abide by the law. Please give appropriate weight to those of us who appreciate the privilege of driving our ORVs on the beach. We are those who don't drive through the dunes, litter, enter restricted areas, etc.. I wish to request you to allow ORV use on Cape Hatteras seashore.  
Thanks.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2851    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.03,2010 10:40:29  
**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:** 2852    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.03,2010 10:40:47  
**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.  
I have thoroughly enjoyed several visits to the national Seashore, but there are sections I avoid to be away from the ORV crowd. It would be fine with me if you could prohibit them entirely.  
In any event, I think it is imperative that the ORVs be prohibited from nesting areas of birds and other wildlife. Build a concrete wall if you have to.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2853    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** May.03,2010 11:08:53  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** My family and friends have visited and fished on the outer banks for many many years. Access to this areas should remain available to the public now and always. My children have gained a vast amount of knowledge about coastal life and the ocean side eco system from time they have spent on the beach in remote areas of Cape Hatteras and other other beaches. It would be a great trajedy for them not to be able to share those same experiancies with their children. Please keep all access areas open for public use.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2854    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.03,2010 11:11:04

**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:** 2855    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,03,2010 11:11:04

**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:** 2856    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,03,2010 11:13:31

**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:** 2857    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,03,2010 11:13:33

**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:** 2858    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Blanton, Thomas E

**Received:** May,03,2010 11:22:40

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please preserve the pristine nature of Cape Hatteras. It is our pride and joy, and we want to enjoy it for generations to come.

**Correspondence ID:** 2859    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Dogan, Ozzy

**Received:** May,03,2010 11:27:29

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I have been going to Cape Lookout with my family for the past 15 years and eventough there has been some changes for the past years; the ongoing banning of ORV appeal on core banks is ABSOLUTELY insane..! As a fisherman and naturalist i have always helped out preserving our beaches and these organizations such as AUDOBON not only actually agains peopel fishing on the beaches but also making invalid comments about what the fishermen doing to the island and its surroundings.. As a family we always enjoyed camping out there and always helped with any type of activity to keep the island clean and undisturbed. Because of Turtles and Birds dying here and there because of mostly natural causes should not ignite a questionable fire.. Truth to be known; every fisherman and person on that island vacationing is extremely responsible and a true nature lover. While commercial fishing is depleting our fish population, unreal banning issues like this will really hurt our economy and our faith to our government.. I really hope that these issue will be resolved. I truly believe that we are-surf fishermen- here till the end to protect what is ours. We are extremely disturbed by what has been going on and fully against the ORV banning. The Local Park Services and Rangers are very helpful preserving the nature and we will stay beside them to help whatever it takes to preserve our island. At the end we are here to protect OBX and its natural surroundings. However if these organizations which is already causing damage keeps on bringing invalid decisions about our island, it will only diminish not only the economy in the surrounding area but leave a big question what we always stand for..Freedom.

**Correspondence ID:** 2860    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,03,2010 11:41:30

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Ladies and Gentlemen of the National Park Service, I have made public comments on this issue, and now i am asking in writing for you to shelve your plan to close the Cape Hatteras Seashore to the public and allow responsible persons to enjoy a unique experience ie driving on the beaches of the North Carolinas Outer Banks. You have been forced to do this ,not by your own choice, a law suit that is trying to make you look like you have not been doing job for the past 30 years. I know this is not true. I have been on the beaches of the outer banks since 1958. I have been fishing these beaches since that time and started driving the beaches at 17 years of age. I was taught proper driving technique then, and still use and teach that today to new visitors when i meet them. As a life long sportsman/fisherman i was taught to respect the out of doors. As a scout I was taught to leave it better than I found it. And that is why I am a life member of the N.C. Beach Buggy Assoc. Their charter mirrored my beliefs in being a great steward of any out door area. I also joined Outer Banks Preservation Assoc. for the same reasons. I am an enviromentalist, I care deeply for all wildlife as do 99% of the people who drive on the C.H.N.S. You have worked side by side with all the groups that use the park and know we want them protected, but not closed. I have had many interactions with park personel and there has never been a problem. 14 years my Black lab has sat by me , never once chasing any bird, biting any one, never being a nuisance to park personel or other fishermen, simply because she was trained! Not all dogs are alike, and that goes for people. Don't let the few people that have no training, influence your decision on beach access. Take a common sense approach to this, The Audobon and like groups want to protect birds, We as a collective you and the visitors to C.H.N.S. want to protect everything at the outer banks. All wild life, all people that live in this beautiful but harsh place. We want it to stay as it is, wild and free. I know of no one in all my years of beach driving that has ever killed a bird, killed a turtle, most catch fish and release them. Should their be regulations, YES. Start with a beach permit for drivers. This will help you and we law abiding groups identify persons that are not being lawfull. Work with us to keep the people and the wildlife safe. We have always done it in the past. I have read on the Audobon site that we are all killers of baby birds and turtles , this is a Lie! We have respected these animals for many more years than these groups ,that have decided we are monsters with out even looking at the accomplishments of the N.P.S. and the organizations that are in place to help keep everyone and everything safe inside your park. Yes they are well funded , how else could they take The National Park Service to court. I s their agenda for everyone or for their own beliefs that humans and animals cannot live together. You Know better than this, C.H.N.S. is a prime example of this. Their data is flawed, their hearts may be in the right place, but their blatent disregard for people and it would seen the truth, is a glaring reminder ,things are not always as they seem. Please look at the coalitions plan, make changes , work with the people you have worked beside for decades. Please allow access ,with park service supervision , to our national sea shore. Jeff Hales

**Correspondence ID:** 2861    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,03,2010 11:41:33

**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:** 2862    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,03,2010 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 years my family and I have summered on Cape Hatteras and Martha's Vineyard. Both communities are blessed with an abundance of beaches, and wildlife. The Vineyard's process of limiting ORV access to certain areas of beach during mating and nesting seasons has provided the necessary respite from human intervention that has allowed species on the Federal Endangered species List to fledge successful nests of baby birds. The implementation of this plan was/is not without its critics. Yet all have learned to live within a larger rhythm of nature. It benefits everyone in the long run.

The larger lesson, I believe is to ourselves and our children. Teaching limits and respect for other living things, and their rights to the spaces and resources of our planet, does much to balance the woeful sense of "entitlement" that most Americans bring to their living and their choices. It isn't always "all about us". We are part of a delicate web of life, and we need as much biodiversity in our lives as possible.

Also, there are a significant number of people who have no desire to be around ORVs, or to experience the damage and effect they have on the beaches. Your plan, at this point, ignores their needs and in the interest of fairness, is not fair.

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

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

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

ORV users should not have access to any more than 50% of the total miles 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:** 2863    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,03,2010 11:41:35  
**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:** 2864    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.03.2010 11:41:37  
**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:** 2865    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.03.2010 11:41:39  
**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:** 2866    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.03.2010 11:42:50  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I have concerns about the ORV issues going around. I have only been going to South Core Banks, Cape Lookout, for 9 years now but have fell in love with it since the first trip. I was introduced to this by some friends of mine that have been going as a group since 1986. I am now a part of this group and can't imagine that pleasure being taken away. Every trip we go is just another opportunity to see God's beauty and we pride ourselves in leaving the Island in better condition when we leave than when we get there. I have rarely if ever seen anyone mistreating this pleasure but have made it a point to say something to them when I did. We all love the chance of sharing this paradise with nature and ORV is our only way to access it. No need to punish those of us who love and respect this place because of a small hand full that don't. Make stiffer penalties for those few and no more restrictions. Thanks for all that the Park Service has done to preserve this great place and I hope I can share it with my grandkids one day as I have experienced it.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2867    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** May.03.2010 11:54:58  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** This new management plan is a travesty in the making. The NPS has been caught after sleeping on the job for several years in not making a management plan until forced to do so by some extremist environmentalist. When that happens, they go for full closure of much of the National Seashore.  
It is possible to create a plan that allows the taxpayers to access the land they support and giving the animals ample opportunity thrive. In addition, the NPS seems to have complete disregard for the economy of the local areas, not understanding the impact this closure will have on the tourism and fishing industries. Each year non-endangered and non-threatened species acquire more and more areas of closure, without apparent reasoning. It seems clear that the NPS would prefer to succumb to the pressure and opinions of a few extremist environmentalist versus doing the hard work to

find a workable and meaningful solution for all involved, human and non-human.

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2868	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	
<b>Name:</b>	obernesser, jane					
<b>Received:</b>	May.03.2010 12:09:58					
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>Dear sirs: My husband and I own a home in Salvo which we rent to guests and enjoy as time allow ourselves. We have owned our home for nine years and our many guests have enjoyed our home as well. The plan to close the beaches would have an enormous financial impact on us as well as on the communities on the island. It might interest you to know how Padre Island in Texas treats its tourists. Rather than restrict use, for example, to monitor turtles and birds, they use and encourage the visitors to monitor the beaches and help them with the wild life. I am really surprised and disappointed in how North Carolina solves its problems. For as many years as we have been coming to the Outer Banks, government officials and environmental groups have been haggling over whether or not to build a safe bridge to Hatteras Island. The safety of the tourists and residents seem to be low on the priorities of the state. Now, we learn about the decision to close the beaches to cars and pedestrians. It just seems to make no sense that you would "kill the fatted calf" as it were. The Outer Banks draws thousands of tourists each year and it is probably the most visited part of the state earning many millions in tourist dollars. I would urge you to carefully consider the impact that closing the beaches would have on us as homeowners and on the tourist industry as a whole.</p> <p>Sincerely, Jane and Pete Obernesser</p>					
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2869	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b> Y
<b>Name:</b>	private					
<b>Received:</b>	May.03.2010 12:10:03					
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>Dear Mr. Murray:</p> <p>My aunt resides on Hatteras Island. Over the years I have visited many times, and lived there for one summer. I love the beauty of the island, and have enjoyed the experience of participating in many beach activities, i.e. windsurfing, bonfires, kiteboarding, and paddleboarding that I otherwise would not have been given the opportunity.</p> <p>I feel that the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area should be protected, but am now aware that with the NPS DEIS access to the beaches will be greatly decreased, and completely limited in some areas; therefore I am in disagreement with large inflexible buffers p.121-127.</p> <p>I hope that the Recreational use of this Park is not destroyed.</p> <p>Sincerely, Joshua Crandall</p>					
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2870	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b> Y
<b>Name:</b>	private					
<b>Received:</b>	May.03.2010 12:11:05					
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>To Whom, As an investor/owner I urge that you make every effort to keep the beaches open &amp; accessible to the public along the Cape Hattaras National Seashore. I have been traveling to this area many years now &amp; have invested in a property because I love the area so much. The beaches are beautiful, pristine &amp; ACCESSABLE. Don't ruin the local economy, we all love the beaches.</p> <p>Sincerely, Thomas McKeon</p>					
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2871	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b> Y
<b>Name:</b>	private					
<b>Received:</b>	May.03.2010 12:12:23					
<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>					
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2872	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b> Y
<b>Name:</b>	private					
<b>Received:</b>	May.03.2010 12:12:35					
<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</li> </ul>					

16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

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

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2873    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,03,2010 12:12:35

**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:** 2874    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,03,2010 12:14:42

**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:** 2875    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,03,2010 12:15:47

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I want to comment on the lack of regard for the owners and residents of Hatteras Island in restricting beach traffic and predestrains from walking on the beaches. Our current rental property will be severely hurt by limiting beach access since this is the reason that visitors come to Hatteras Island. The residents are already seeing a decline in their economy due to the present restrictions. Tightening these restrictions will do irreparable damage to the economy of the Island that now in a recession and trying to recover from last year's financial disaster. Please reduce or do away with the restrictions.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2876    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Heitz, Stephen T

**Received:** May,03,2010 12:17:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I do not support total beach closure. Closure during special nesting and hatching periods may be appropriate. To the extent possible limited access should be available at all times. Pedestrian access should be permitted at all times subject to limited access to nesting areas.

**Correspondence ID:** 2877    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Eastman, Catherine B  
**Received:** May,03,2010 12:17:59  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 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. By allowing 40.8 miles of beach to be closed to ORVs you allow for the re-establishment of species both flora and fauna. Interstitial invertebrate organisms pay a huge cost by repeat pressure of beach driving and those same organisms are providing food source to many of the T and E migratory bird species. You still provide ORV access including areas for fishing and kite surfing. All user groups are considered in this Alternative. Please choose Alternative D. Also for the ease of management. There will be less need, other than the initial enforcement requirements, to manage opening and then re-closing areas for both ORV users and the T and E species. This open-close process would be confusing to the user groups and the T/E species that will recruit to the seasonal areas. I have many safety concerns involving pedestrians and ORVs. So far this season in Florida one pedestrian, a child, was killed by a vehicle on the beach (traveling at the appropriate speed) and another seriously injured. By having separate areas, pedestrians can avoid the ORV areas and there won't be as many concerns for safety. Ample fishing areas and access have been considered by this option. Long term year round closures are imperative to the wintering T/E species. As the National Park Service you are charged with the ultimate task of balancing conservation of species and natural resources with public use. When the lands were designated folks didn't know what our population would be in this century. You have the task of making sure users don't love the Seashore to death. This Park was created for the enjoyment (reasonable) of all humans for many generations to come. Please consider this when selecting your management options. Thank you for listening.

**Correspondence ID:** 2878    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,03,2010 12:23:17  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** To Whom It May Concern:  
I own a home in Waves, NC and have been coming to the Cape Hatteras National Park for over 35 years. I work for Gateway Insurance Services, Inc. in Kitty Hawk, NC.  
The beach closures since 2008, have adversely affected almost all of the businesses that are located on Hatteras Island. I know this because insurance applications require gross sales information from the business owner and the gross sales of businesses on Hatteras Island have been steadily decreasing since the beach closures were implemented in 2008. The business owner's have directly told me that business immediately drops off when the beach access is closed to the public and ORV.  
Furthermore, the closures are directly affecting the homeowner's on Hatteras Island. The value of our properties have fallen due to the beach closures. The people who visit this park, come to enjoy the beaches and the activities the beach offers such as: fishing, shell collecting, sun bathing, and surfing. The Cape Hatteras National Park is a public park, paid for by the taxpayer's dollars. The park should remain completely open for the American taxpayer. The park service was able to provide access to the park for the public and it also protected the various breeding birds and turtles for almost 50 years prior to the consent degree. There is no reason it cannot continue to protect the birds and turtles using the same guidelines it had in place prior to the 2008 consent degree.  
I urge the park service to maintain open access for the public and ORV, under the guidelines that worked so well for the taxpaying public and the environment. Those guidelines were in place prior to 2008.  
The park service has instead decided to close large tracts of the public beach in a misguided effort to protect certain species of birds and turtles. The park service has been actively removing many other animal species such as foxes and racoons in favor of these birds. Why are these birds more important than the foxes and racoons? The piping plover is not on the endangered species list.  
Has the park service decided that certain species are more valuable than others?  
The public was guaranteed access to all of the beaches when the Cape Hatteras National Park was created. It appears the park service cannot be trusted in it's own promises to the American taxpayer's.

**Correspondence ID:** 2879    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,03,2010 12:24:39  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** My Wife and I own a property on Hatteras Island. We purchased it because of the islands beauty. Tourism in this area is critical and any further restrictions to beach access would cripple the economy. I urge you to not restrict beach access any further so as to present the island for what it is ....a natural and beautiful place to relax

**Correspondence ID:** 2880    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,03,2010 12:25:49  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** The differences between rabid environmentalists and the ORV community are irreconcilable. If ORV access is allowed, a region and her people will be saved. Should you allow outside environmentalists to bulldoze their distorted worldview into this region, the Outer Banks will cease to exist as we know it today. The consequences of bowing to the whims of these environmentalists are endless and you know it. It's that simple.  
For more than two decades my family has visited the Outer Banks to hunt, fish and enjoy her beaches and lifestyle. We have insisted on and maintained and healthy respect for the land and the wildlife. I have never EVER seen anyone in an SUV show anything less than the upmost respect and deference to nesting areas, etc.  
The NPS must know that there are hundreds of thousands, if not millions, of people who want the OBX to stay exactly as it is. More confidence and faith must be shown to those of us using the land and beaches for recreation, but more importantly for those living there full-time. Please do not destroy the Outer Banks, especially in the name of making peace with leftists who are not from the region and rely on gimmick science and rhetoric.

**Correspondence ID:** 2881    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,03,2010 12:27:25  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I support CONTROLLED off road access to the Cape Hatteras National Seashore and beaches. The protection of wildlife should come first. I was disgusted to read that slander and pathetically bad manners were the rule of the day at the Buxton DEIS public hearing/comment meeting. If folks there feel so strongly about the access, why didn't they (locals) try to find and report those responsible for the intentional damage to signs and fencing at

closed areas? That would have displayed law abiding action and could only have helped in their quest for unlimited and unfettered ORV access. Those folks don't care about the environment, rules, or regulations. All they care about is the almighty dollar and how fast they can make a buck. I am tired of hearing that their 'way of life' is being changed. Our pioneer ancestors way of life changed, too - sometimes for the better, sometimes not. We learn to adapt, that's why the human brain is more intelligent. Please, impose whatever limits are necessary to protect our wildlife. Take care of them - someone has to! Then do whatever is required to enforce the laws that are passed and prosecute those who will break the laws.

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2882	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596		
<b>Name:</b>	Sivertson, Gary T						
<b>Received:</b>	May,03,2010 12:27:38						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I cannot believe that the thought of closing the Outer Banks Beaches could enter someones mind. My family have been visiting the beach on Hatteras Island for 44 years. There must be some way for the human race and birds/ turtles to cohabitate. I have never seen anyone run over or hurt a bird or turtle. How do birds and turtles have the importance disrupt and financially ruin thousand of peoples lives. I am wonder if any of these people making these decisions have a home there, have any family working on the island or are effected financially by this decision. I am sure this radical decision will not affect any of you politicians. You probably knew this was going to happen long ago and were able to sell your homes and investments before they become worth pennies on the dollar. VR Gary Sivertson						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2883	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,03,2010 12:33:37						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I am a vacation property owner in Avon NC, part of the area affected by this discussion. We use our vacation property as a rental and rely on local management company to care for it and book our rentals. I am quite certain that a number of our guests are beach drivers. Having said that and knowing that my income may be negatively affected by a stricter guideline on beach use, I am all in favor of these restrictions. I have spent the last 20 years dodging SUV's and pickups racing along the beach. I have had to snatch my children almost from under their wheels. I have seen how little many of these drivers regard what once was the pristine yet wild beauty of Hatteras and I would gladly do with a little less. It has been injurious to the island itself to have these vehicles here and to have the housing that has been built to shelter them during their stay, if shelter means in home pools and theatres etc etc. I long for the quiet beach box days of Hatteras and trust that you can bring that back to us through a more strict management policy. Good Luck.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2884	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596		
<b>Name:</b>	Heilman, Daniel						
<b>Received:</b>	May,03,2010 12:36:31						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	As a homeowner in Salvo, NC, I am very concerned to hear the NPS is considering Alternative F outlined in your Draft Environmental Impact Statement. This will have a devastating impact on my vacation home investment and I will no doubt be forced into foreclosure unless I can sell the property to cover the current note. Historically, A very substantial portion of our rental income is generated by fisherman who count on vehicular beach access. I implore your to consider the economic impact while deciding on the best course of action. Daniel Heilman						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2885	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596		
<b>Name:</b>	N/A, N/A						
<b>Received:</b>	May,03,2010 12:38:32						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Cultural/Historical Significance On Saturday May 1 a charter fishing boat (Tide Runner) capsized in Hatteras Inlet close to shore. The capsized boat was eventually noticed by other fishing boats and rescue of 4 of the family members was effected. Alas, the Captain's father drown and the family dog was missing. No one on shore was able to render assistance because no one was on shore. This popular surf and surf fishing area was closed to vehicles and pedestrians under "pre nesting closure" protocols: in other words someone died because a bird might nest in this area. The long standing tradition of surf rescue dating back to the 1870's with the establishment of the US Life Saving Service is ignored. The fact that surfers are often the 1st responders in a water rescue is ignored. The fact that anyone on shore could have seen what happened and called for help is ignored because "a bird might nest here". When/if a bird actually nests, we should give them room (certainly not 1000 meters of room): these birds sometime nest in our outdoor showers and under our eaves. That human presence will discourage nesting is just not consistent with what we can see.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2886	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,03,2010 12:40:52						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please keep the beaches on Hatteras Island open to the public. Our family has been vacationing in the Outer Banks for decades. We love the beaches. We respect the land and its natural inhabitants. We are careful to leave the area as we found it. We always avoid areas that have been roped off by park staff. People who know and love this unique part of our country take care of it. Believe me, we want to see the Outer Banks kept in pristine shape. But, we do not believe that you have to cut off access to the beaches.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2887	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,03,2010 12:47:52						
<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.						

0009614

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

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2888    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,03,2010 12:48:32  
**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:** 2889    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,03,2010 12:49:14  
**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:** 2890    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,03,2010 12:50:10  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am 25 years old and have been vacationing in the OBX my entire life. We would not consider our family "environmentalists," simply because I'm not sure how best to define that word in society nowadays. We do, however, define ourselves as caretakers of the environment. Why? Because it is our responsibility.  
My parents taught me to be polite, strive for excellence, and most importantly - "clean up after yourself." They also taught their five children to make the most of life. That's why they made the eight hour drive every summer to Frisco, NC, when they could have driven three hours to a host of beaches in the VA/MD/NC/DE region. The OBX is a special piece of land and we've always prided ourselves in keeping it special. Anyone who has stepped foot on Ocean City beach, Maryland, or Dewey Beach in Delaware, knows that it is the manifestation of the sociological phrase: "diffusion of responsibility." It's not just that the beaches are crowded. Because beach goers treat these beaches as "any other beach," they do not take pride in the land, and thus trash is left, buried, or swept into the ocean for fish food. In 25 years, I've never once seen that take place in our special beach in Frisco, NC.  
I think it's time the community of OBX and their friends, like my family, be trusted to take care of the land as they have for so many years. I've seen the

0009615

nesting grounds of the piping plovers and sea turtles, and we've always respectfully avoided those areas. Again, I've never seen anyone violate those terms...in 25 years.

As a next generation beach goer who is looking forward to investing in future vacations in OBX, I ask that you acknowledge me, and my family and friends, and the work we've done and will continue to do to preserve this special place. If not for me, then acknowledge the local community who have been preserving it for generations.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2891	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596		
<b>Name:</b>	Patterson, Betsy						
<b>Received:</b>	May.03.2010 12:51:29						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Keep Cape Hatteras National Seashore open for public use. Protect but do not prohibit.						

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2892	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May.03.2010 12:51:56						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Free and open beach access is simply the only answer to this ridiculous debate. The National Seashore is for the enjoyment of the residents of this nation not for control and manipulation by "special" interest groups.						

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2893	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May.03.2010 12:53:44						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Public Parks are for the "USE" of the public. I can understand reasonable environmental cautions, but I cannot support environmental extremism. I have made three vacation trips to the Outer Banks and am planning a fourth visit this summer. If the beaches are restricted from use, why should I drive halfway across the country to visit. Please keep the beaches open.						

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2894	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596		
<b>Name:</b>	Thorne, Arthur L						
<b>Received:</b>	May.03.2010 13:13:19						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Hi I own a home on the Outer Banks I would just like voice my thoughts. I don't understand why for years the people and the birds got along fine. But it seems now all of the sudden people can't seem to go any where that a bird might be. What is happening are the birds suddenly more important than the people who by the way pay taxes that I think might pay your salary. So unless the birds are gonna start paying all of you I suggest you try to get something done that will let both of us to get along.						

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2895	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596		
<b>Name:</b>	Meekins, Manson R						
<b>Received:</b>	May.03.2010 13:20:13						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	As one whose family comes from Hatteras Island, I can say the people of this area are really suffering these days. If not hurricanes, it's the economy; if not the battles getting the bridge replaced, it's northeasters washing out the highway. Now, adding to the woes, off road beach driving, long the only way to get to point A from B, is being curtailed. While I agree that management of this tremendous resource is needed, where is the humanity with the decisions we have seen. One troublemaker disturbs a fenced area, and everyone must suffer? Please remember it was the local people who first saw the value in the Seashore, and have been stewards, like the NPS, for all of these years. We all love the wildlife that congregates on these shores, but when forging your management plan, keep the people in mind. They looked after the land before you arrived, and they will continue to no matter what. But they must be able to make a living, and it's not getting any easier with the current regulations. Thank you.						

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2896	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May.03.2010 13:21:25						
<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>						

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2897	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May.03.2010 13:21:25						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						

0009616

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
Superintendent Murray,  
Please stop listening to the lies and false data being given by these special interest groups. These beaches should be accessible by all, but a group of loud and belligerent people have been allowed to write the rules in their favor.  
Please remember that all tax payers contribute to the NPS, not just the special interest groups. Many of us love this island, and want to be able to enjoy it for a long time. My 5 year old son's eyes light up at the mention of it. Are you going to tell him that he will not be allowed to enjoy it any longer because of people's greed?

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2898    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,03,2010 13:21:35

**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:** 2899    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,03,2010 13:27:34

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am against any further restriction of use of the beach

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2900    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,03,2010 13:32:36

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** The only reason birds try to nest on these beaches, is because these shores are so lightly used by humans.

If the use by humans was more sufficiently intense, birds would not attempt to nest here.

Development adjacent to these areas was based, in part, on the value of the close access to these fishing, birding, and surfing areas. This plan serves to penalize those who gently share the land now by restricting them from it. Of course bird nesting will increase. It would increase in Daytona or Virginia Beach if you kept all humans miles away from those shores as well. The residents are being marginalize due, in large part, to their small numbers and inability to mount an expensive rebuttal to this excessive plan. It feels downright UnAmerican.

Please review the details with experts on the law. Many of the buffering requirements are of questionable origin.

Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2901    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,03,2010 13:52:34

**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:** 2902    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,03,2010 13:53:06  
**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:** 2903    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,03,2010 13:53:07  
**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:** 2904    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,03,2010 13:53:08  
**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.

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2905	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	
<b>Name:</b>	Creef, Donna V					
<b>Received:</b>	May.03.2010 13:56:16					
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>Vehicular and pedestrian access is a historical activity on the Cape Hatteras National Seashore beaches. Species management is important but not at the expense of local businesses in Dare County and at by under-cutting the recreational activities of the residents and visitors of the Outer Banks. The socio-economic section of the DEIS does not accurately reflect the true effects further restrictions on access to the beaches will have on the local economy. The environmental groups need an issue to keep their donations coming and access to the Cape Hatteras beaches are the latest victim of these groups. It's not their friends, neighbors and families that are being impacted by these restrictions. As resident of Dare County and user of the Cape Hatteras beaches I see first hand the effects of the restrictions. Protect the human species not just the bird and turtle species.</p>					
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2906	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	
<b>Name:</b>	roberson, james r					
<b>Received:</b>	May.03.2010 14:00:22					
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>I have been fishing at the Cape Lookout National Seashore since going with my dad starting in the 1970'.A lot has changed there in the past 40 years.When the Government took over in 1984 i believe it was.There started removing all the old vehicles off the island.Not long after that the dunes started to disappear.I had heard many times the Gov, even thought they could build a asphalt road up and down Davis Island.What a laught.I believe in change,and i believe that all people should have the right to visit Cape Lookout National Seashore.But i believe that things should be left as they are and let nature take its course.I read a article a magazine this morning that at the present rate with the ocean rising by 2 feet that by the year 2100 Capelook National Seashore will not be there.</p>					
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2907	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b> Y
<b>Name:</b>	private					
<b>Received:</b>	May.03.2010 14:03:11					
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I am in favor of the continued use of Off Road vehicles on the Hatteras beaches.					
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2908	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b> Y
<b>Name:</b>	private					
<b>Received:</b>	May.03.2010 14:12:18					
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>Hello, My understanding when the "National SeaShore" was created it was designed for both human recreation AND wildlife. The current plans and options for ORV management restricts both pedestrian and ORV use to such an extent that they are severely curtailed in favor of even one small wildlife element.</p> <p>ORV curtailment should be the minimum necessary as documented by the 'Coalition for beach access'.</p> <p>The access curtailments proposed by the NPS will largely eliminate many areas from practical recreational use, especially for people who have small children, elderly, or disabled persons.</p> <p>The park should be kept open, with the minimum protections for piping plovers, sea turtles, etc as practical.</p>					
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2909	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b> Y
<b>Name:</b>	private					
<b>Received:</b>	May.03.2010 14:15:38					
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>To whom it may concern, if the NPS deems to mandate to the people who frequent the beautiful shores of the Outer Banks any more regulations regarding the use of the beaches our family, which frequents the area every summer will no longer do so. Simple as that. When we are there, we frequent the churches, restaurants, off shore fishing, grocery stores, clothing, gift and seafood stores. We love the area. Please do not allow this new unfair push to take over our beloved beaches.</p>					
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2910	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	
<b>Name:</b>	Wynn, Sharon B					
<b>Received:</b>	May.03.2010 14:20:15					
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>I disagree with proposed Alternative F. I feel that the prohibition on allowing pets on the beach is too restrictive and that it will have an adverse effect on tourism. Alternative F restricts beach access at several popular ramps which will also have an adverse effect on tourism. The economy of Hatteras Island is built almost entirely on tourism. If Alternative F is enacted, I believe that many local residents will lose their jobs and property values will plummet.</p>					
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2911	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b> Y
<b>Name:</b>	private					
<b>Received:</b>	May.03.2010 14:22:47					
<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>					

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2912    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,03,2010 14:24:04  
**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:** 2913    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,03,2010 14:24:04  
**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:** 2914    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,03,2010 14:24:32  
**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:** 2915    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,03,2010 14:24:41  
**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.  
Forget all the above!!! I do not know who these tree huggin fools think they are that their plans, thier likes or dislikes, would effect the overall well-being of a species. When I look at the vast area of Ocracoke's south point, and consider that the inlet access of that area is prohibited because some bird displayed a breeding behavior near the area that we drive on, it makes me sick. Two choses, close an area because a bird flew over it, or leave the area open to driving, perhaps encouraging the bird to "move over". All we want is a narrow ribbon of sand above the high tide line to get to the inlet on. But no! The left wing nut jobs, backed up by a left wing all knowing judge, have won out. If these SOG's gave a D\*@N about the wildlife, they would be doing a captive breeding program. I would love to know the true cost of each piping plover that made it to fledging on Ocracoke last year. I do not remember, what was the # ?, 5? 8? How many total manhours of park service personnel went into doing those things necessary to keep up the consent degree. Convert those man hrs. into payroll \$ and publish the cost per chick fledged why don't you? Then ask the tree huggers if they got their tax dollars worth? I do not know, but I would not be a bit suprised if the cost of a chick exceeded \$10,000. And that cost does not included the lost revenue to local merchants by folks like myself who are not coming down because of the closures. All this because humans are cut off rather than having a bird move over a little bit.  
But in the grand scheme of it all, do not forget the real purpose for this whole mess. That purpose is the self-perpetuation of the Audobon and SELC groups. The plover is nothing more than a tool for these predators of the weak minded do gooders to use to further their personal agendas.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2916    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Jennings, Larry E  
**Received:** May,03,2010 14:26:39  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As with hundreds of other individuals, my wife and I own rental properties on Hatteras Island, and like 90 plus percent of such owners we will most definitely see our properties go into foreclosure if they are not rented, and it is an absolute certainty they will not be rented if people are not permitted to walk on and enjoy its beaches. It is unbelievable that one or two organizations could not only kill the economy of Hatteras Island, but at the same time bring financial ruin to those who support the Island!  
We pray that you oppose this effort to close the beaches that all Americans should have the right to enjoy!  
Thank you.  
Larry and Janet Jennings

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2917    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** May,03,2010 14:33:21  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am writing to strongly support open and accessible beaches for the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area. I believe in open access for everyone is consistent with the enabling legislation that created America's first National Seashore. In my experience of vacationing on Hatteras/Ocracoke over the last 30 years, I have consistently found area residents and visitors to be faithful stewards of wildlife. As an avid bird and wildlife watcher, I support resource protection for shorebirds and sea turtles and feel certain this can be accomplished in a way that is equiatable to all. Who better than the people who live on the island to advocate preservation of area wildlife than the people whose lives and futures are intertwined to the success of each species.  
In the past, I think the Park Service has done a great job of protecting endagered wildlife by roping off areas where birds and turtles are nesting but still allowing beach access that does not disturb nesting areas, etc. However, the changes in the approach over the last few years does not seem to make any difference to the wildlife and only frustrates people wanting to come to Hatteras for the ultimate in beach vacationing. Who wants to go to the beach where thousands of people are crammed into a half mile stretch of accessible ocean? I sympathize with the full time residents who have carved out a marginal living based on fishing, boating, camping, tourism, food services, etc. They have a difficult enough time dealing with the unpredictable weather and all that brings to the island. I have a difficult time understanding why this area was developed as a tourist destination if everything that makes it a great place to visit will be made unaccessible to the public.  
I truly hope you can find a solution which protects the wildlife as well as people who live there.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2918    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,03,2010 14:44:30  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** CAPE HATTERAS NATIONAL SEASHORE BELONGS TO ALL THE PEOPLE, not to just the special interest groups. The current restrictions in place have already impacted our family and guests in a negative way. Further restrictions are unacceptable to enjoy this truly beautiful place. Cape Hatteras National Seashore should remain open for everyone to enjoy.  
Russell Scarberry Salvo, NC

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2919    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,03,2010 14:54:07  
**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.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2920    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.03,2010 15:10:58  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I plan to retire to my beach house in Avon, NC. Although, I believe that balancing the nature, social, and economic of the area is important, I do not support too restrictive access to our beaches, for the sake of something idealistic. What's good is nobody lives in the area for lack of business or job opportunity to support people's stay. We can have all those beautiful beaches, lots of animal or birds species and so on, but the area is like a ghost town with no human being in sight. I will sell my beach house and go somewhere else with better rules or regulations that permit human and nature to coexist. By the way, who's is to pay for all the infrastructures, roads, bridges, waterways restorations, community services....Of course, we can't exact taxation from the sandy beach or from beautiful feathered birds. Humans, local residents and visitors pay for those to support everyone, sandy beaches, beautiful and rare flocks of birds, included. Please think hard before jumping to conclusion. We're living in a real world, which was not and never will a utopia. Only fools think and believe in a utopian world. Again thank you for allowing people to stay locally and visitors to appreciate what the area has and offers and let not be too extreme, one way or the other, in making a decision that will have profound adverse social and economic impact to the area.  
Regards,

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2921    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** McGuire, Michael J  
**Received:** May,03,2010 15:17:06  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Mr. Mike Murray Superintendent, Cape Hatteras National Seashore National Park Service 1401 National Park Drive Manteo, NC 27954  
Dear Mr. Murray,  
As a homeowner in Avon, N.C., I thank you receiving and considering my thoughts regarding the issues relating to Cape Hatteras National Seashore. As I compose this letter, we are all watching developments in the Gulf with keen interest making it easy to recognize that we all care and all share responsibility for preserving natural resources and wildlife. The point of my letter is to request that the National Park Service (NPS) apply a balanced view to its responsibilities in preserving nature and wildlife with the impacted cultural and economic environment.  
At present, our Avon home is a rental property and while we do spend an average of 5 weeks/year there, the home will become our permanent retirement residence in 2014. For nearly 20 years, I have been an owner/visitor to Hatteras Island and one very strong reason for my continued return is the sense of community and the responsible, balanced view of residents, many of whom make their living from the waters off the Island. Everyone seems to understand the necessity of maintaining "balance" with regard to the ecosystem and all its inhabitants, whether it is fish or fowl, animal or mammal.  
I am concerned about NPS decision making in this matter along two points ?  
1. The long term socioeconomic impacts of beach restrictions... a. In a beach tourism area, over restricted beach access for recreational (OVR, fishing, and pedestrian usage) is a harbinger of economic death for business owners, homeowners and residents. This is a fast-moving slippery slope leading to business and local tax base evaporation to be followed shortly by public services and then eventually, population. b. The 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 fact, the statement "protect and preserve natural and cultural resources" appears in the first sentence of the first page of the Purpose of the Plan section and numerous times thereafter. Yet, the entire 800 page document with the exception of only two paragraphs of analysis of cultural resource issues and impacts to the region, clearly abrogates its responsibility in this regard.  
2. NPS's inexplicably uneven application of "best practice" and of study data? a. DEIS study data includes visitors to National Monuments further north where the bulk of vacationers visit, rent and reside thereby skewing numbers in a direction that does not reflect the reality of the DEIS impacted, southern shores, b. DEIS ROI data includes northern shore areas such as Duck which is clearly outside the cultural and economic norm of the southern shores, again oversimplifying the adverse economic impact to the southern shores region, c. Concern over NPS not adopting more proactive techniques used at other East Coast locations proven to encourage Turtle nesting success such as nest relocation and other effective measures, d. NPS closure policies address the least significant factor affecting nest survival - human interference which accounts for only 3% of all AMOY nest failures with storm, tides and various predatory species accounting for 91% of all AMOY nest failures. The nests are simply abandoned at a rate that is twice that of human interference!  
I don't think it's too much to ask that the National Park Service reasonably and fairly include the people (that also pay the taxes that enable NPS to function and do its good works) as part of the local ecosystem. Hopefully, then, other DEIS Alternative Plans or newer compromises can be agreed to achieve the best result for all parties.  
Thank you for your consideration.  
Michael J. McGuire  
40047 Antillas Rd 14704 Brougham Way Avon, NC 29715 Gaithersburg, MD 20878

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2922    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Zovistoski, Charlotte K  
**Received:** May.03,2010 15:29:05  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I disagree with the NPS statement (pg 377) that ORV and other recreational use will have long term adverse impacts on sea turtles due to the amount of seashore available for ORV use and by allowing night driving on the beach. The "Major Adverse" events as defined by the NPS (pg 377) have not occurred or have occurred infrequently. It is unnecessary and punitive to all users of the park, to impose around the clock closures of substantial size, 105 meters wide to the surf-line (pg 125) for events that are not occurring. Turtles usually nest at night and closures to the surf-line would be prudent at night. A turtle night nest watch program will ensure no ORV impact. Closures, 10 meters square, will be adequate during the day until the hatch date, thus protecting the nests while having insignificant impact on visitors.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2923    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,03,2010 15:30:21  
**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:** 2924    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,03,2010 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 I am not, nor shall never be one that utilizes off road vehicles. The only possible exception may be if and when the day comes that an extremely low or no impact walking or hovering vehicle were available at sometime in the future. Perhaps I will have to work on that.  
Until that day comes, the following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2925    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,03,2010 15:40:57  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I agree with the NPS Visitor Education Program. It provides a great way to educate people of all ages on a variety of subjects relevant to the seashore. My own children learned so much from the Rangers: surf fishing, pirates, beach creatures, history, conservation and on and on. I think this program is 100% beneficial to all who participate. NPS should be commended for this effort!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2926    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,03,2010 15:48:23  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please do not close the beaches at Hatteras National Seashore. The impact will be devastating to vacationers that have planned trips to the OBX but also to home owners who rely on rental income to pay mortgages. This action will have very real and far reaching repercussions that will cause further problems for the already struggling Hatteras area. To name but a few the effects will include mortgage foreclosures, businesses closing and income for residents decimated.  
Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2927    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,03,2010 15:55:16  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I disagree with NPS choice of Action Alternative F as the preferred alternative. Action Alternative F is not the least restrictive solution that will benefit people and wildlife. Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area is a "recreational area" for people, not a wildlife sanctuary. NO scientific evidence has been presented to indicate that restrictive measures, greater than those in the Interim Plan, are necessary to protect wildlife. The needs of the people, locals and visitors, should be the highest priority in formulating beach access policies in a recreational area.

**Correspondence ID:** 2928    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May.03.2010 16:05:40

**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:** 2929    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May.03.2010 16:06:03

**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.

Preserve our jewels of the environment for present and future generations to enjoy God's creation!

Let people who want to zoom around go to an amusement park!

**Correspondence ID:** 2930    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May.03.2010 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.

I support Audubon's stand on this issue. I would like to add that I have had personal experience with ORV drivers. They are usually wild careless people who do not care what they ruin just as long as they have "fun." They will drive anywhere and not be concerned about the damage and noise they cause. I have even seen them chasing animals in the forest. Granted, there are some thoughtful ORV drivers, and they often help in crisis situations, but my experience is that they are of the minority.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2931    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Ferguson, Jonathan L

**Received:** May,03,2010 16:15:25

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Superintendent Mike Murray, I have been coming to Hatteras Island for over 5 years at least twice a year. I have enjoyed the communities there and have done my share to help promote the local economy. I always come with the 4 Plus and Capital City 4 wheelers for their surf fishing tournaments. During my time fishing, I have observed a commitment by these fisherman to respect beach closure signs, respect our environment, and respect the rights of others. It is a common practice to leave the beaches cleaner than when you arrive. We have always cleaned up after ourselves and cleaned up any garbage or debris that washes ashore. Many of these fisherman have been coming down faithfully for more than 20 years. I have been very disappointed by the expanded beach closures over the years. Yet I have always seen fisherman abiding by the rules that have been outlined for us. Alternative F restrictions 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. \*\*No piping Plover deaths have been attributed to ORVs. \*\*ORV violations continue to decrease as signage and education improve. \*\*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. \*\*Frisco, Hatteras and Ocracoke villages closures to ORV access is longer than the traditional May 15 to September 15 period even though seasonal visitor statistics are similar for all villages. This does not seem right. \*\*These buffers and closures force more people into smaller areas which could potentially result in more resource impairment and diminished visitor experiences. \*\*MLI is overly restrictive. Pedestrians and ORV corridors or bypasses should be provided through, around or below high tide line in all Species Management Areas during the entire breeding and nesting season to maintain access. Piping plover unfledged chicks buffer should move with the brood as it relocates to reliable food source, not expanded. \*\*Night driving restrictions penalize pedestrians and ORV users. \*\*Nesting female turtles have not been killed. \*\*False crawl statistics do not support the theory that light pollution is a significant problem at the Recreation Area. \*\*Predator management and nest enclosure practices encourage ghost crabs which are a primary predator of turtle eggs and hatchlings. The very purpose of the DEIS as set forth in the National Environmental Policy Act 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. \*\*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 historical identity." Why has the NPS failed to appropriately address the traditional cultural value of surf zone access? The MPS failure stands in direct violation of its legal responsibility under section 106 of the NEPA and the NEPA framework as a whole. Analysis of economic impact to the Seashore Villages appears to be significantly down played. During my visits I have noticed a decline in the number of visitors. I have notice a decline in the number of participants in the fishing tournaments that I attend. I know that the small businesses have seen a major impact. Recently I have heard that predators of birds and turtles have been hunted by park employees to protect the birds and turtles. This is outrageous. Night driving of ORVs is a deterrent to predators with very little risk to the turtles or birds. It is amusing that hunting these predators is "OK" just to protect a select few other species. Please carefully consider the impact the rules which you establish may have on the community. The fisherman/ORV users often clean up after themselves and others. They deter predators of the species which you have chosen to protect. I feel as though our freedoms are being taken away because a select group of individuals has implied that ORV users have had a negative impact. This just doesn't appear to be true. Thank you for taking the time to read this.  
Jonathan Ferguson

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2932    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,03,2010 16:31:48

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I disagree with the Draft ORV Management Plan/EIS. We are a family who have been coming to the Outer Banks since we were children and as adults have been lucky enough to realize our dream of owning a home on the southern outer banks in Avon. To afford the home we must rent it to other vacationers. After five years our average rental income is just barely enough for us to continue to own it and any disruption in this average will force us to sell the home. We have several other friends/families that have second homes nearby in the same situation and while I cannot know for sure, I believe that a significant percentage of the home owners that rent are in a similar predicament financially. Many of our renters are fisherman who come regularly and exclusively for the quality of beach fishing that is so rare and so highly treasured. Many have told us that any additional restriction in beach access is going to force them to find other fishing and vacation options. Rental income on the Outer Banks is tenuous enough with the constant threat of weather and changes in the national economic condition limiting tourism at times. Any addition restriction to beach access is going to impact visitors enough that it will tip the balance for a great many of us who will be forced to abandon our investments that can be more accurately described as a labor of love for Cape Hatteras and the southern outer banks. Regards, The Cromley Family Oakton, Va.  
Owner of Easy Breezy in Avon.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2933    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,03,2010 16:35:56

**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:** 2934    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.03.2010 16:35:57  
**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.  
The Parks belong to everyone and I want to use my Parks for wildlife watching and enjoyment more than anything else.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2935    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.03.2010 16:35:57  
**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:** 2936    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.03.2010 16:36:05  
**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

0009626

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

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2937    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.03.2010 16:36:07  
**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:** 2938    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.03.2010 16:36:11  
**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:** 2939    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Smith, Brett C  
**Received:** May.03.2010 16:38:17  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please do not limit our access to this wonderful stretch of coastline. I'm a surfer and a North Carolina native and I've been traveling to the Outer Banks for a long time. I love our coast please do not take the freedom of the Outer Banks away from us!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2940    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Hanner, Donald S  
**Received:** May.03.2010 16:51:59  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please keep Cape Hatteras and Ocracoke open to all Public access,Including ORV's. Alt. A preferred

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2941    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Brown, Veronica L

**Received:** May,03,2010 16:54:50

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** We have been enjoying vacations on the Outer Banks for many years. Part of the fun, excitement and beauty of our vacations has always been driving on the beaches to experience the wonders of the ocean, from sunrises to sunsets, to shelling, kite flying and experiencing the wonders of nature. All of the sea creatures have existed for hundreds of thousands of years and have learned to adapt and live with "us". We respect them and they respect us!

After experiencing "closed" beaches a few years ago and talking with the "locals", it is quite clear that the Outer Banks would just not be the same without the ability to drive on the designated beaches. Tourism would surely suffer and we all know what that means! Less people = Less MONEY! Let us all work together to allow the beauty of the Outer Banks to be experienced as it should be - Please do not allow the beaches to be closed to vehicular traffic! Enforce rules, initiate restrictions, but allow us to continue to experience the wonder and beauty of the Outer Banks as only the Outer Banks can deliver!

Sincerely,  
Veronica L. Brown

**Correspondence ID:** 2942    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Hanner, Jan W

**Received:** May,03,2010 16:59:11

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Alternate A preferred.

The beach is for people. The birds and turtles will do just fine without the help of Enviromentist Lawyers, who only sue for the money!

**Correspondence ID:** 2943    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,03,2010 17:06:16

**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.

Dear Superintendent Murray,

Having lived in the Carolinas for several years and enjoyed the natural beauty of the coastal areas in particular, this is an issue that concerns me greatly. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

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

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

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

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

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

**Correspondence ID:** 2944    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,03,2010 17:35:56

**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:** 2945    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,03,2010 17:36:12

**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:** 2946    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May.03.2010 17:36:38

**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:** 2947    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May.03.2010 17:36:56

**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:** 2948    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May.03.2010 17:37:27

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

0009629

**Correspondence:** It is important that kiteboarding is allowed at this location. The ban will adversely impact the local economy. (I for one will stop coming to Cape Hatteras). Thank you!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2949    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,03,2010 17:38:18

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** To Whom It May Concern:

I have vacationed at the National Seashores in both Mass. and North Carolina. I believe these beaches to be national treasures and that they need to remain accessible to the general public.  
Education of how to care for and use these areas should and could be made more readily available to anyone who ventures out to these beaches. Closure of these areas is akin to closing the Smithsonian.  
Accessibility to the beaches is crucial to the local economies in North Carolina. Including Avon, North Carolina (Hatteras Island). I loved this Island so much that I was married on the beach in Nags Head (Bodie Island) and purchased a home on Hatteras Island. I hope that every American Taxpayer can have the same experiences that I have had with my friends and family on these beaches.  
Keep the beaches in North Carolina open.  
Very truly yours, Mary Ellen McKeon 79 Neill Dr Watertown, CT 06795

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2950    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,03,2010 18:07:27

**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:** 2951    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,03,2010 18:08:45

**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:** 2952    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Poplawski, Tomasz  
**Received:** May,03,2010 18:09:39

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:**

OBX is one of the top 10 windsurfing and kitesurfing destination in the world. This kind of use causes very little, if any, damage to the environment: wind sport enthusiasts spend time 95% on the water, merely rigging their gear on the shore, usually by rental houses sitting on the sound. They tend to be very careful about the land use, and they cause no pollution, since no fuel is involved. I am a great enthusiast of environmental protection initiatives but I cannot see how making such activities illegal in Outer Bank could be beneficial to any life form. That would also kill the entire industry of rental shops, sport schools, not to mention great decrease in values of rental properties along OBX, which wind sport enthusiasts reliably book when almost

nobody else is interested, in the spring and fall.

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2953	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596		
<b>Name:</b>	lancaster, taz						
<b>Received:</b>	May,03,2010 18:28:48						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	THIS CRAP IS CRAZY! YOU CAN NOT DO THIS STUFF PEOPLE DEPEND ON THESE BEACHES THERE HAS TO BE ANOTHER WAY!						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2954	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,03,2010 18:36:18						
<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>						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2955	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,03,2010 18:40:12						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>I am writing to voice my opinion against any policy instituting limitations on beach access. The natural beauty of the beaches is there to be enjoyed in a responsible way. Currently those who enjoy the beach enjoy it responsibly. To propose to limit access is irresponsible as it supports the wishes of a few while the majority is ignored.</p> <p>My family and I have been visiting the Outer Banks since 1994. Our vacations began in the northern Outer Banks. We were drawn to the natural beauty of the coast and have been unable to find that beauty anywhere else along the east coast. As the population and congestion of the northern Outer Banks swelled we were drawn to the serenity of Hatteras Island. We have enjoyed, as a family, so many vacations centered around the ocean and all it had to offer. To think that restrictions will be placed on beach access flies in the face of what this country is founded on. Freedom.</p> <p>Additionally, we fear that the local economy, which has already suffered, is in grave danger. The prospect of limiting beach access will significantly reduce tourism and the local economy will fail. Who will visit HI if there will be no access to the ocean. North Carolina has spend many advertising dollars promoting the beaches in order to promote tourism to the area.</p> <p>It seems impossible that such an issue is clogging up the legal system. The finality of such a decree is irresponsible. With great passion we oppose any limitations placed on beach access on Hatteras Island.</p> <p>The Galletto Family Kimberton, PA</p>						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2956	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596		
<b>Name:</b>	Marion, Larry R						
<b>Received:</b>	May,03,2010 18:53:51						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I am 69 years old, been coming along time. Its a shame we can't all share this woderful place.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2957	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,03,2010 18:55:42						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>I am writing to ask you to please keep the beaches open to both pedestrians and vehicles in the area of the National Seashore including Ocracoke Island, NC. My family has been visiting the area for 10 years. My husband travels there several times a year to fish, frequenting the local fishing store and restaurants, and we bring our children in the summer and fall to enjoy the pristine beaches. The beauty of these beaches is that they ARE remote and require 4WD and some respect for nature to reach. People can follow some reasonable rules to preserve wildlife and I believe people and birds can co-exist there. Limiting access to the extent that has been recommended means people in the Outer Banks who depend on tourism for their livelihood will see their businesses ruined and people who depend on the Outer Banks for access to nature and relaxation and beauty will suffer from the loss of those attributes. I am sure that reasonable people will be able to agree to rules and regulations that offer protection to the shorebirds that need it, while leaving access open to as many people as possible, to preserve the way of life that has been in place on the edge of NC for years. Thank you, Anne Dagner Crozet, VA</p>						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2958	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,03,2010 18:56:21						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I am strongly opposed to any restriction of vehicles having access on the beaches within the national seashore at the outer banks in North Carolina.						

0009631

**Correspondence ID:** 2959    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,03,2010 18:57:41  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Hi, I am a frequent visitor to Cape Hatteras and was quite alarmed to hear that there is a movement to ban kiteboarding and windsurfing along with other activities there. I think this group of islands are absolutely beautiful and hope that you don't take access away! I have always believed that the recreational sports that I do bring economic growth the areas that allow them and don't have any significant impact on the environment at all. We don't pollute at all and bring revenue to the outer banks during especially the months of May and September when other tourists are going elsewhere. Best regards Fraser King

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2960    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,03,2010 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 Cape Hatteras National Seashore a half dozen times and I hope to many times more. It is one of the most beautiful places in America. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

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

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

There are so many places where Off-Road Vehicle users can ride their vehicles and so few beautiful natural places left. Why do we have to let their NOISE POLLUTION destroy this beautiful place and the enjoyment of others? Keep Cape Hatteras free of motorized vehicles.

Please protect this beautiful piece of America.

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2961    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,03,2010 19:12:35  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** There is too much irrationality on both sides. The environmentalists would prefer there not to be anyone but them anywhere on the Outer Banks while the ORV spokesmen are incensed by anyone wanting to take away their unalienable rights to the whole beach. The groups overstate their cases, but I think they all would ultimately agree to middle ground. I suggest that the middle ground would be to avoid beach driving in the areas that the public would be endangered (the villages) and the areas where wildlife is most plentiful and especially unprotected. With these guidelines in mind, areas that are important to recreational fishermen and sunset worshipers alike can be opened for enjoyment. This whole issue has upset so many people. It has set good people against good people. Let's seek the middle ground based on reality, not the fictions of fear. Choose a criterion based on science and good sense and stick to it.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2962    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,03,2010 19:23:46  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I 100% disagree with the new potential beach plan. My family has owned a rental house on Hatteras Island since 1983. We rely on the rental income to pay for the mortgage and the expenses on the house. We allow dogs to be able to get extra rental income and because dogs are such an important part of families lives and vacation. This new plan will probably put our house and our family out of business as homeowners. We would probably be forced to sell because we have heard from families, renters, businesses, fisherman, etc that Hatteras Island will no longer be the destination intended. We like many people who agree with this plan love the environment and all the animals, birds, etc that go with it. But common sense needs to prevail. Let's put together a win-win plan that has compromise and is fair. This country is built on compromise. Compromise must prevail. I know it sounds bad but we beg you to please use common sense and put together a plan that is fair to all parties and does not limit the beaches which will have a terrible effect. Hatteras Island needs to be open to everyone - adults, kids, dogs, birds, fisherman, sun bathers, surfers, etc. I look forward to the outcome because I trust and pray that in this great country common sense and compromise will prevail!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2963    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Collins, Elizabeth T  
**Received:** May,03,2010 19:34:11  
**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:** 2964    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** goss, Randy f  
**Received:** May,03,2010 19:35:14  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I have fish the hatteras area since a kid. I think while the wildlife needs to be protected the locals also need to be protected. It seems to me that it is in their best interest to also preserve the island and its wildlife habitat. It seems that having people who do not live on the island making the rules for the people of the island is just plain wrong. The DOW or Audobon would be really upset if the people of the island destroyed their home wherever that may be. Let the people of the island speak for themselves and rule themselves. Is that not what our country is based on. Randy

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2965	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May.03.2010 19:37:59						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I have been fishing North Carolina's Outer Banks for over thirty years. The beaches are cleaner and fishermen are more aware of the need to keep them clean than we were then. I feel that it is important to allow ORV access to these areas for both economic and recreational reasons. I think the Outer Banks should be left open to ORVs. Thank You, Eddie White						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2966	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May.03.2010 19:43:18						
<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. I have visited the Outer Banks since 1971 and although not nearly as overbuilt as many east coast beaches, it is still kind of heart breaking to see what it has become. Please remember that much of it is a National Seashore and not just your backyard. Please do all possible to save wildlife and habitats. Thank you.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2967	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May.03.2010 19:44:34						
<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.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2968	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596		
<b>Name:</b>	N/A, N/A						
<b>Received:</b>	May.03.2010 20:10:12						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I think 1000yd buffer is way to much, there can still be a buffer zone to protect the birds and still have access to the areas of interest						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2969	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May.03.2010 20:13:48						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	We have been homeowners since 1982 and Hatteras has been and is our Heaven on earth to all of our family and renters most of whom are returns. This project will destroy what Hatteras is all about for ALL who come here and it will put our family in an impossible financial position dueto renter noy returning because of this plan. If it is not broken DONT fix it. !!!There is room on our beaches for ALL creatures GREAT AND SMALL. Please I beg you Let it stay as is. May God hear my prayers as HE always does. Get a grip on what is reality and the right thing to do Thank you. Betty Nowalk						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2970	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May.03.2010 20:28:57						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	been going to the outter banks for fifty years. will turn 75 in nov. there is no way i could fish without my orv. bought a picup with aslidein for just fishing calco. have been recycling before it became pop. also hunt and am a strong conservationest. keep our recreaational nat. parks open to the public. g.e. stadler						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2971	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May.03.2010 20:51:20						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	My wife and I are retired and on a fixed income. A few years ago we entered into the purchase of a beautiful beach house on Hatteras Island (Waves) along with our daughter and son - in - law. We did this for two reasons: our family (12 grand children) has been spending the last nineteen years vacationing for a week in your wonderful state and we are very much in need of the income gotten from renting our beach house to pay off our mortgage. I don't know who has brought up this lawsuit (no one with property on Hatteras Island)but I do know that our family along with many others will suffer hardship if the beaches are closed. Why go to the Outer Banks - Hatteras Island if the beaches are not avaiilable? What happens to your North						

Carolina residents who have invested in not only houses but restaurants, gas stations, grocery stores, speciality shops and so many other types of business? How much money will the state lose without the tax base in Hatteras? It's one thing to keep vehicles off the beaches but to keep people from the ocean does not make sense to those of us who look forward to visiting every summer. So many questions to be answered before making a decision - hopefully those of us who have invested SO MUCH in your state will be given every consideration.  
Joe & Emmy DeGregorio #9 Dinell Dr. Pittsburgh, Pa 15221 412 - 952 - 6938 (cell)

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2972    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,03,2010 21:29:56  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I have been going to Cape Lookout, for the past 20 or so years. and I have been enjoying to beauty of the Island there for that period. also I have taken a bunch of people that would have never had a chance to see the beauty over there if it wasn't for the orv rules that are in effect now... some of the people that I have taken with me said that they never would have imagined that a place like that even existed.... I am now 62 years old and I visit the park about six to ten times a year. I do not travel the beaches alot. but , I do travel to a place that I camp at, while I stay on the park. ( Island ) I stay, usually from 4 to 7 days at a time. During the past two decades, I have seen a lots of changes, both in the enviornment and the changes that the Park Service have made to keep the orv permits going so we can enjoy the island. I try to obey all rules and regulations that apply and encourage others to do that also. Cape Lookout, is a special place, that God has placed on earth, I feel like it should be protected, by the rules and regs. that the Park service has right now, but I know that God has control over the enviornment. No matter what we decide to do, He controls every thing over there. The beaches, the birds, the turtles and thier nest, and the crabs. belong to him. One hurricane, can destroy, everything that man has tried to regulate and maintain. The Island has been cut into several times and recently it has been connected back together. Neither man or rules have any control over such things. One day, and I hope that it is not in my life time, I feel like it will be destroyed completely for a period of time. and we will have no control over this and we will not have any control over rebuilding it back.  
Now, having said all this, I use a 24 ft motor home, over there and use a parking permit. usually for about 20 to 26 weeks, also I take it over and back two to three times a year. I said that so you know that the permits and ferry service and also the ice and fuel that I pay for contribute to the economy around there. I also park it in storage during the winter and have spent thousands of dollars in the area maintaining it so I can enjoy my time that I spend there. I also buy fuel and grocerys, and supplies in the area around there to help in not having to transport everything from home. I use resturants, and hotels during some of my stays. This helps in the economy of the area. I usually buy bait and fresh fish from the docks in the area.  
If the orv regs are changed drastically, or even banned totally, I would have to quit coming to enjoy that special place on earth that I have to just to get away from everything and enjoy nature. Even though I am just one or two people at a time, If enough people feel like I do, I feel sure the economy in that perticular part of North Carolina, would be brought to a stand still and family business's that have been maintained for centuries would fail. Just my two cents worth, THANKS FOR LISTENING.....ARCHIE MURPH ( Hoping to enjoy life on the island for years to come )

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2973    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,03,2010 22:21:50  
**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.  
OFF ROAD VEHICLES DO NOT BELONG IN THIS 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:** 2974    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,03,2010 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

0009634

implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2975    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.03.2010 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:** 2976    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.03.2010 22:23:54  
**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:** 2977    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Braeuer, Toby  
**Received:** May.03.2010 22:47:10  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Sirs,  
on behalf of the worldwide kitesurfing community who value the area of Hatteras as one of the best places in the USA and in the world for kitesurfing, we ask you to not pass any restrictions planned to limited access to the beaches.  
Kitesurfers are in harmony with the elements and the nature, who are not noisy nor destructive.  
Please consider this as a request on behalf of about 30.000 kitesurfers from around the world.  
Regards  
Toby Braeuer www.kiteforum.com

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2978    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.03.2010 22:51:55  
**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:** 2979    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,03,2010 23:21:54  
**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:** 2980    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,03,2010 23:52:12  
**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:** 2981    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,04,2010 00:52:21  
**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:** 2982    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,04,2010 00:52:23  
**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:** 2983    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,04,2010 01:10:05  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I would like to note my support for Plan C for the proposed Cape Hatteras National Seashore Off-Road Vehicle Negotiated Rulemaking and Management Plan. I believe that it presents the most well-balanced of the alternatives. While doing nothing (Plan A) is irresponsible to the environment, Plan F is much too restrictive. While it may be the most environmentally sustainable option, it certainly is not socially or economically sustainable. Visitors to the Cape Hatteras area should be allowed access and recreational use of the beautiful area in a well-balanced manner.  
Regards, Stanley Tse

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2984    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,04,2010 01:22:22  
**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.

---

0009637

**Correspondence ID:** 2985    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,04,2010 01:52:26  
**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:** 2986    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,04,2010 02:22:32  
**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:** 2987    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,04,2010 02:56:45  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** To whom it may concern I have been watching and playing a small part in the on going Beach closures along the East Coast. The Rift between the NPS and the Locals has been a long one and I see both sides. I do beleive that there can be a cordial relationship between both , I am a avid outdoorsman and Have hiked the Appalachian trail. So I know a little about what it takes for both parts to work together. I do beleive that there has been to much growth on the banks in some areas. And I also beleive that the NPS has over stepped its boundries in others. I enjoy coming down , with my 4x4 and driving to the point to where I want to fish, I can't tell you how amy times me and my family have enjoyed the solitude of the Banks. We drive to our spot and we leave the same way. respectfully. I hope there can be a way for my grand kids to enjoy it and even me when i get old and not able to walk the long walk to the Point. I know how to solve this problem. For i know the locals and I also know the enviromenalist. And i can bring them both together. REALLY !  
Sincerely Steve Easter

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2988    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Russell, Gregory L  
**Received:** May,04,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Sir or Madam,  
The Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational area is exactly that: a recreational area not a wildlife preserve that a few individual and groups are looking to make happen. Many parts of the proposed Draft Management plan authored by the Park service and US department of interior are extremely unbalanced in favor of a few wildlife speices as opposed to the hardships that will be imposed on the human species. I support a free, open and balanced access to the this beautiful national recreational treasure with reasonable resource management.  
I am against as they now read the following portions of the proposed Park Service and Department of Interior Draft.  
1) Any piping plover unfledged chick brood will require a 1,000 meter pedestrian/ORV closure around it in all directions. This equals approximately 771 acres per brood. This restriction will apply anywhere in the park, even on the beach in front of your vacation home as well as in the designated "wilderness areas." (p. 121-127) 2) Any American Oystercatcher nest or brood will require a 300 meter pedestrian/ORV closure around it in all

directions. This restriction is almost as severe as that for the piping plover, even though the Oystercatcher is not a federally threatened species. (p.121-127) 3) No pets, including dogs, will be permitted, either leashed or unleashed, on Cape Hatteras National Seashore public lands including the beaches between March 15th and July 31st. (p. 136) 4) ORVs will be prohibited year round between ramps 27 and 30, at Hatteras Inlet (Hatteras Spit), Ocracoke Inlet (North Ocracoke Spit) and various other locations. (p. 97-101) 5) Night driving will be prohibited between May 1 and November 15th, forcing visitors off of the beaches early in the evening and preventing sunrise surf fishermen access in the morning. (p. 104) 6) Pedestrian access will be prohibited from March 15 until July 31 in 8 different beach locations which have traditionally been available. (p. 121)

**GLARING SHORTCOMINGS IN ALTERNATIVE "F" INCLUDE:**

The plan does not address in any detail the following intended and obvious shortcoming which is MANDATED by the National Environmental Policy Act. This reaffirms the intent by a few to turn the Recreational area into a Wildlife sanctuary.

1) Out of the 810 pages that detail all aspects of the plan, only two paragraphs are devoted to the analysis of the preservation of cultural resources, even though this action is required by the National Environmental Policy Act. This is unfair, unreasonable, presents a mockery of the law, and shows the extreme bias by those who wish to turn this from a National Recreational Area into Wildlife sanctuary 2) The socio-economic data and analyses are incomplete and erroneous and result in an understatement of the effect the restrictions will have upon the Island, the region and the state of NC. (p. 270-286, 561-598). The US Park Services answer: Businesses will have to "adapt" to the new rules. (p.383) The negative economic impacts of the decree ARE KNOWN, so to say that the added restrictions would have negligible to moderate impact is indefensible.

I do strongly favor reasonable management practices such as has been presented by Dare County NC Board of Commissioners and included in reasonable management practices are: 1. SCIENTIFIC study as to what constitutes a reasonable distance to keep car and pedestrians away from endangered breeding bird and turtle species. 2. Institute practices used by the Department of Interior elsewhere in the United States in the management of threatened species such as sea turtles whereby in some case nests can and have been moved. 3. Allow corridors for human kind to access the beach both in east-west and north south direction on the beach.

The Draft as now written has and will continue to have a immense negative impact economic to Dare County residents. Many affidavids have been presented to the Park Service showing this beyond any doubt and stated in absolute objective terms

We have lived in NY, CT, GA & now VA. We (our family) have travel many hundreds of miles for over 40 years to come to the outer banks in Dare County NC. My wife and I, our children, and our grandchildren all enjoy coming to Avon, NC to ENJOY THE BEACH, OCEAN, MAJESTY OF THE DUNES, AND JUST WALKING UPON THE SHORELINE. The Park Service and Department of the Interior draft plan for the management of the National Recreational Area as it now reads will end our ability to use and enjoy this National treasure and I am against the existing draft, as stated above, at it now stands. "REASONABLE and FAIR". THOSE ARE THE WORDS WORD THAT PARK SERVICE MUST PLEASE KEEP IN MIND WHEN FINALIZING THE MANAGEMENT DOCUMNET.

Respectfully Sincerely yours,  
Gregory Russell, Moseley, VA

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2989    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** hooper, jimmie a

**Received:** May,04,2010 04:49:35

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** after reading parts of the proposed rules for beach access,I have become very upset,to put it mildly! Alternate F:771 acres per brood! Isn't this just a little excessive? NO PETS between March 15 and July31: If on a leash,what harm does this do: How about the natural predators? What do you propose to do about the 'possums,coons,ghost crabs,wild cats,snakes,etc? Year round closures for orvs between ramps 23 and 27? This is the most ignorant thing!!Why year round? Now,my comments and questions! I was born and raised on Hatteras Island.When I was much younger,my father would take the family for a ride on the beach.We would stop and walk,play,swim,fish or whatever.During these trips,my dad would tell us to enjoy and respect what was here.He would tell us this for several reasons.If you enjoy and respect something,you are going to take care of it.Also,he'd say "enjoy it while you can,because there is coming a day when you won't be able to walk,much less drive on the beach.The park service will close it."I asked my dad more times than one why he felt this way.And his answer was always the same;"because a thief will lie to you and a liar will steal from you!The Park Service stole the land from the people.They promised to leave it open and already they have closed areas to the people!" My dad has been dead a number of years,but what he said is true.Funny how someone 40 years ago could foresee these things! I mentioned respect;as I said earlier we were taught to respect the things that were given to us.Respect the things of life.Respect other peoples feelings and their wishes.Respect.....that goes both ways.If I respect you then you should respect me.This is not happening!The NPS is making it very difficult for the people to respect them.I will admit,I'm one of those who has lost respect for the NPS! But, respect can be won!In this case,use common sense and leave access to the beach open.Have some balls and don't listen to all of these Society groups.Listen to the people!!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2990    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,04,2010 04:52:46

**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:** 2991    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Blecher, Bob

**Received:** May,04,2010 05:21:14

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:**

Following are the four major themes representing my core comments on the DEIS ? ? CORRIDORS are a vital tool in providing access while managing resources ? MANAGEMENT BUFFERS must be based on peer-reviewed science ? NON-ENDANGERED BIRDS should not have same protection as if endangered ? TURTLE MANAGEMENT would benefit from nest relocation and other practices

Corridors are vital to providing access in a way that does not hinder resource protection. Therefore, I believe pass through corridors (below mean high tide if necessary), should be maintained for pedestrians and ORVs in all areas of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area throughout the entire breeding and nesting season.

The extreme buffers outlined in DEIS pages 121 to 127 must be modified to substantially reduce the minimum 1,000 meter buffer in all directions required in Alternative F for unfledged Piping Plover chicks. I believe a more appropriate and yet effective buffer is 200 meters. Ample scientific evidence and precedent exists to support a 200 meter buffer. As part of the NEPA process, I request the National Park Service to provide peer-reviewed science that justifies a 1,000 meter closure in all directions. Buffers for other species, including American Oystercatchers, Least Terns and Colonial Waterbirds must also be changed. An effective 30 meter buffer should be established for these species rather than the 300 meter closure outlined in the DEIS.

Under the Endangered Species Act (ESA), all endangered species must be protected. However, there is no requirement in the ESA to give non-endangered species the same level of protection. I believe the National Park Service should reevaluate its position of giving birds designated only as a North Carolina species of concern, the same protection as those truly endangered. This request is consistent with management practices in other federal parks. The purpose of individual states establishing lists of species of concern is to earmark those for special statewide monitoring and tracking. The management buffers described in pages 121 to 127 of the DEIS should be modified to allow pre-nesting closures for only endangered or threatened species. This important modification would result in establishing pre-nesting closures exclusively for the Piping Plover, the only threatened bird species in the seashore. Accordingly, pre-nesting closures are not warranted for the non-endangered and nonthreatened American Oystercatchers. Because Colonial Waterbirds do not return to the exact same place for nesting each year, establishing pre-nesting closures for these birds is both unpredictable and unnecessary. Additionally, in monitoring and tracking birds for purposes of determining resource viability, all birds in the same ecosystem of the seashore should be counted. When conducting a bird census of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area, it is imperative to count the many birds on the nearby dredge and spoil islands that are located just yards away and within sight of the seashore. These birds are part of the same ecosystem and should be included.

I believe endangered sea turtles would benefit from management practices now in use at other federal seashores that are more proactive in efforts to achieve nesting success. This includes relocating nests to more desirable locations as is done in other state and federally controlled areas. The Loggerhead Recovery Plan recognizes that, "Historically, relocation of sea turtle nests to higher beach elevations or into hatcheries was a regularly recommended conservation management activity throughout the southeast U.S." (2009, Second Revision, page 52) while the North Carolina Wildlife Resources Commission (NCWRC) sea turtle program currently recommends relocation only as "a last resort." The National Park Service in page 125 of the DEIS relies upon the approach used by North Carolina Wildlife Resources Commissioner (NCWRC). This contradicts the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) practice of relocating nests on the Pea Island Wildlife Refuge, located on the north end of Hatteras Island, North Carolina. By not supporting nest relocation, the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area has lost over 46% of the nests laid in the last 11 years. Meanwhile, South Carolina relocated 40.1% of its nests during 2009, resulting in an incredibly low lost nest rate of only 7.7% making a strong case for the relocation of nests. The turtle management practices outlined on DEIS pages 125, and 392 to 396 should be modified to allow nest relocation as a tool for species recovery.

In summary, I urge the National Park Service to make changes in their preferred alternative F to incorporate the provisions outlined above. In doing so, I believe it will be beneficial to the long range success for wildlife, enhance the visitor experience and improve the lives of those living near the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area. Without these changes, people will suffer harm. On the subject of harm, I conclude with comments about the economic harm as outlined in the DEIS. On page xlvi, Alternative F is characterized as having a "negligible to moderate" adverse impact on small businesses. I believe the negligible to moderate projection is inaccurate and relies on economic surveys that has not yet been published. Furthermore, this material is not expected to be added to the DEIS until after the public comment period has ended. Based upon the economic harm already experienced under the consent decree, Dare County projects the economic impact of Alternative F to be substantial. Family-owned businesses are the backbone of Dare County. Hard working, local families have for generations provided employment opportunities for the community, and offered outstanding service and hospitality to Outer Banks visitors. These small business owners do not ask for special favors or government handouts, just a fair opportunity to earn their part of the American dream. Beach closures have already had a devastating and unfair impact on many Dare County businesses causing foreclosures, bankruptcies, lay-offs, cutbacks, expensive refinancing, and depleted college funds and savings accounts. Even businesses whose revenue has stayed level or showed a modest increase have accomplished this at a costly price. Many have had to cut back employee hours, forego much-needed capital improvements, and sacrifice profits. These hard-working people have already suffered greatly because of beach closures. It is unfair and inaccurate for the National Park Service to describe their pain under Alternative F as "negligible to moderate."

Thanks for the opportunity to comment, Bob

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2992	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,04,2010 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	My family & I have been going to Cape Hatteras National Seashore since 1993 and have made it a bi-annual event ever since. We are pleading that you not close down the vehicle beach access. This is a national park, therefore there should be public access. Hatteras island thrives on tourism and by denying access to the beaches the economic welfare of Hatteras island will suffer. I ask that you consider the natural dangers of the seashore on the wildlife such as storms and erosion and not just blame it on the public access. Again, this is a national seashore not a national refuge (such as Pea Island), therefore, the public should be allowed to enjoy the beauty and wonder of Cape Hatteras National Seashore.						

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2993	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,04,2010 05:42:32						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	My family & I have been going to Cape Hatteras National Seashore since 1993 and have made it a bi-annual event ever since. We are pleading that you not close down the vehicle beach access. This is a national park, therefore there should be public access. Hatteras island thrives on tourism and by denying access to the beaches the economic welfare of Hatteras island will suffer. I ask that you consider the natural dangers of the seashore on the wildlife such as storms and erosion and not just blame it on the public access. Again, this is a national seashore not a national refuge (such as Pea Island), therefore, the public should be allowed to enjoy the beauty and wonder of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Public access for all!!!						

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2994	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	
<b>Name:</b>	krug, jeff						
<b>Received:</b>	May,04,2010 05:44:05						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	To whom it May concern: I'm very alarmed at the thought of losing access to one of America's great oceanfront areas on the Outerbanks of NC. I try to get there once a year for at least a week, and cannot imagine losing that privilege. Though I very much agree with protecting the area to keep it pristine, protecting it to the point of eliminating human enjoyment of the area goes way too far. Ultimately, any natural area such as this is treasured because we can enjoy it, and peacefully co-exist with the wildlife. Some environmentalists seem convinced that wildlife cannot co-exist with us, and not only is that pure conjecture, but borders on ludicrous. As an avid wind-sport enthusiast, I can think of no other activity that is more in harmony with nature and less detrimental to it. Sadly, there are a few who will not be happy until mankind is						

forced to hide from nature in the name of protecting it.

Ironically, here in Massachusetts the "environmentalists" have decided to poison (i.e., kill) crows in the name of protecting piping plovers. Clearly this policy illustrates what can happen when environmental zealots have their way; I find it hard to balance the concept of protecting one species of wildlife while killing another. This is not protection of nature; it is merely interference with it.

A sane and balanced policy is all that is needed here; rules should exist to keep the area a vital, clean, and enjoyable place for all...safe for wildlife and mankind alike. Eliminating access is no more sane than is killing crows. It's a dangerous path to govern and guide ourselves by the voices of a few extremists.

Sincerely,  
jeff krug

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2995    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,04,2010 05:50:41  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I first came to the Outer Banks over 40 years ago. I have been impressed with the deliberate management of its growth, but mostly that it remains much the same as it was when I first came years ago. Currently the infrastructure, especially in the south, supports a manageable number of visitors to the beaches and protected areas. Rather than prohibiting access to these areas I recommend that, if you want to protect this American treasure, you will redouble your efforts to control growth. It appears that the only threat to the Outer Banks will be a significant increase in seasonal population, not access to the beaches.  
 Brian Hajost

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2996    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,04,2010 05:52:55  
**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:** 2997    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,04,2010 06:08:47  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** as the founding member and past chair of the Hatteras/Ocracoke Island Council, a part of the OBX Chamber of Commerce, I would like to address the economic impact of the ORV issues we confront. Any argument that suggest that the economic impact to Hatteras and Ocracoke Island's have been less than cribbling, obviously do not live on the islands and certainly do not own a business here. I own several, and it has been a negative in so many ways. It should be pretty obvious. If you lived and worked in a ski resort town, and then all of a sudden parts of your mountain were closed down, folks would start looking for another place to go. Same difference. Our guest come first and foremost for our beaches, and many for the 4WD access. With access issues uncertain, some of our guest have stopped coming. And that has hurt our local economy. And many locals have been forced to move away as businesses continue to shrink.  
 Having lived on Hatteras Island for 25 years, I feel like I have a pretty good read on the pulse. And while most locals would prefer to see the access of the beaches return to the "good ole' days" where virtually all the beaches were open all year, I would venture to say that "ALL" locals would agree that they could live with a middle ground.  
 as a resident, business owner, and council member, I protest the consideration of Alternative F  
 for all the reasons describe I urge you to adapt Alternative A

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2998    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Hege, Robert L  
**Received:** May,04,2010 06:12:07  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am in favor of continuing letting ORV's continue driving on the beaches on Hatteras Island. People using ORV's to access fishing areas and follow other recreational pursuits tend to come together and form clubs; such as NCBBBA and DIFF; to help protect and give back to the resources that we hold so dear. I and I feel the vast majority of Fisherman have absolutely no problem whatsoever in driving around turtle and bird nesting areas. Furthermore I would venture to say that building million dollar homes on the beaches does far more damage to beach heads than driving does. The great thing about these barrier islands especially the park areas like on Hatteras or Cape Lookout is they are unlike anywhere else around. Vehicles are needed to access the different areas on these sea shores. While the ocean may give and take away I have not seen where driving on the beach head has played a major role in expediting that process. I have seen hundreds of Yards of beach Dissappear with a storm, and another return what was there in the past and a whole lot more. I plead that you do not take away this special privilege. Surf Fishing is my favorite recreational pursuit, and I would rather do it no where else than on the shores of Hatteras and Cape Lookout; which i fear will be the next park where Driving ORV's on the Beach will be attacked. Thanks for your consideration of this response. Robert Lee Hege

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2999    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** raynes, donna v

**Received:** May,04,2010 06:21:15

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:**

I have been coming to hatteras island all my life. My children have experienced the wonder of the beaches and my husband and I are fortunate to own a home in salvo-4 lots back from oceanfront. we have always been advocates for protecting the fragile environment and have taught our children, friends of our children, our friends and everyone that will listen about the rules and how to live in harmony with the wildlife. Respect has been the norm rather than the exception and we have a membership with the NCBBA.

As an occupational therapist that rehabilitates disabled people, I have enjoyed bringing people to hatteras,taking them out on the beach via ramp 23 and giving them hope that they too can enjoy the wonders of nature despite the disability. Some of these people thought they would never be able to look at the ocean again much less be out in the sand-thanks to 4wd access!

Now, I hope I don't have to explain to them that radical environmental groups have deemed a bird more important than humans and are trying to take away the access they once enjoyed.

Shame.

Donna Raynes Director of Rehab Westmoreland Rehabilitation and Healthcare

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3000    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,04,2010 06:25:21

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:**

As a Realtor, for over 25 years, working mainly with land, I've seen similar situations all over North Carolina. Our growth has been a blessing, and a challenge. Yet, this is the same scenario of over reacting to a co-existing problem. We must stop allowing the special interest groups to dictate the solutions.. Folks,,use common sense,, we as humans all have that ability,, we just need to step back from the verbage, and look. I'm very pro-conservation, and believe that some steps are necessary, but I'm tired of this "banter". Its time the National Park Service, step up and tell everyone, the facts that they "see". Park Rangers need to tell the pros, and cons of their everyday co-existing with the surrounding nature. Without this input, there is no way that the best solutions can be reached. The world is an always changing, evolving, and we are as well. As I said earlier, I'm very much pro-conservation--- protecting the fishing (with limits), wildlife, dunes,,ect,,, but we can do this and still have access to the Outer Banks of North Carolina. I have spent my 54 years in North Carolina, and enjoy all aspects of this state, and want my children, and children's children to be able to as well. If for one minute, I truly believed that stopping beach access would save it all for them,, then I would stand up and scream to stop it. You know that is not the case. I love the beach, the mountains, the woods, the lakes, pretty much all of outdoors,, so lets put all this to bed by using common sense, and set out long range goals, which allow year round coexistence with nature.

Thank You, John Robinson A North Carolina son, that promotes the life we have here

---

0009642

**Correspondence ID:** 3001    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Brittle, Walter L  
**Received:** May,04,2010 06:33:29  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** My wife and I purchased our home on Ocracoke Island because we loved driving on the miles of open seashore in our 4X4, fishing and walking the beach. We strongly support keeping the beaches open and accessible and we support reasonable conservation measures. We urge you to change your plan proposal to allow corridors around nesting area everywhere and at all times. Also, your buffer management proposal specifies a buffer that is too large. We urge you to significantly reduce it to a size that can be proven by scientific studies to be appropriate. Please don't take away our year around free access to the beach. Thank you for considering our view.  
Yours truly, Walter and Jennifer Brittle

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3002    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,04,2010 06:33:54  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Sirs:  
I am 50 years old and have been coming to the Outer Banks since I was a small boy. My father helped me learn to fish at the Outer Banks, and we actually caught our first salt water fish together in Nags Head. Going to the Outer Banks has been one of our favorite family vacations. So much so that we eventually bought a house in Salvo and we spend quality time there during all seasons. We enjoy going to the beach with my 2 year son, and being able to drive onto the beach allows my parents, both of whom I'm still blessed to have with me but who have difficulty walking, to go to the beach as well and enjoy watching their grandson play in the sand. Restricting beach access would not allow this to happen. This area of God's world is one of the few places remaining that you can enjoy this type of beach access, and is an important reason that we have made a substantial investment in this area. Keeping this beach access available to us, and our renting guests, is very important. Generations of families have maintained and protected this area from many threats, they have weathered the worst that nature can provide, and they are committed to perserving their heritage. Please don't penalize this commitment by taking away their lively hood.  
Thank you for listening.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3003    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Teets, Blaine  
**Received:** May,04,2010 06:39:47  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As I understand the positioning of your strategy to limit driving on Hatteras Island. I also understand the value and history that Hatteras provides us as individuals.  
I have surfed the Outer Banks since I was young and lived in Rodanthe for a couple years. Having access to the shoreline and the shore beaches is a vital part in our success as surfers. Not to mention, non-surfers can experience a day or week of solitude by being able to access less crowded beaches. Being able to pull up my Jeep, pop a tent, build a fire and surf is something that I enjoy. I have just as many supporters as I do critics. The Outer Banks is locally run and dependent on community decisions. Let this be a community decision because ultimately, these are the people that will have to deal with this. I think you know what the decision would be if the decision were based on the community---LEAVE IT AS IS.  
Don't change on what has been so vital to our community and the regulars that visit the Outer Banks.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3004    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** May,04,2010 06:44:08  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Your abrupt rejection of the request( 30 day extension for comments) by Senators Hagan, Burr, and the congressman tells me all I need to know. You have become a quango. See writings of Daniel Hannan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3005    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,04,2010 06:53:02  
**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:** 3006    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,04,2010 06:55:50  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please keep the beaches open. Consider a fee for people driving out on the beaches and use the money to have more patrol for the drivers that misuse the privilege.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3007    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.04,2010 07:01:13  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** "I am a resident of North Carolina who enjoys recreational opportunities offered by the Cape Hatteras National Seashore and Recreational Area. Reasonable and safe pedestrian and vehicular access to the beach is essential to participate and enjoy these resources and opportunities. I also support restrictions and conditions necessary to protect the birds, sea turtles, and other biota that are supported by scientific data and can make the Seashore home for part of the year. I believe the favor alternative (#7) advanced by the NPS is more restrictive than necessary to meet protection of the Seashore. I have read and agree with the proposal to manage ORV's on the Seashore prepared and submitted for consideration by the Coalition for Beach Access. My position is that the NPS accept this alternative or at least postpone a final decision on the ORV Plan pending further review and negotiation on the counter points raised by the Coalition for Beach Access."

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3008    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.04,2010 07:01:50  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** My family and I have been vacationing and fishing on Ocracoke Island for the last 15 years. Every Summer we spend two weeks camping and I myself fish on multiple dates the rest of the year. Last year we trimmed our camping down to one week, this year we are not going. Normally I would have fished Ocracoke at least twice by now but have not, I actually have no plans at this time. All of this is due to the severe restriction placed on my ORV and point access. Please give us our beaches back!  
 Regards,  
 Paul J Ramos Raleigh, NC

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3009    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** May.04,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** preserve reasonable and safe access to the beach for recreational purposes and without harming the biota found on the Seashore. The Outer Banks Preservation Association has formed a Coalition for Beach Access and that group has done an enormous amount of research and work to prepare and publish a sound alternative to the favored alternative advanced by the NPS. I have listed the website for that document as well. The Coalition for Beach Access ORV Access Position Statement can be accessed at: [www.obpa-nc.org/position/statement.pdf](http://www.obpa-nc.org/position/statement.pdf) (77 pages). Please feel free to use this written comment as your statement:  
 "I am a resident of North Carolina who enjoys recreational opportunities offered by the Cape Hatteras National Seashore and Recreational Area. Reasonable and safe pedestrian and vehicular access to the beach is essential to participate and enjoy these resources and opportunities. I also support restrictions and conditions necessary to protect the birds, sea turtles, and other biota that are supported by scientific data and can make the Seashore home for part of the year. I believe the favor alternative (#7) advanced by the NPS is more restrictive than necessary to meet protection of the Seashore. I have read and agree with the proposal to manage ORV's on the Seashore prepared and submitted for consideration by the Coalition for Beach Access. My position is that the NPS accept this alternative or at least postpone a final decision on the ORV Plan pending further review and negotiation on the counter points raised by the Coalition for Beach Access."

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3010    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** May.04,2010 07:03:13  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am a resident of North Carolina who enjoys recreational opportunities offered by the Cape Hatteras National Seashore and Recreational Area. Reasonable and safe pedestrian and vehicular access to the beach is essential to participate and enjoy these resources and opportunities. I also support restrictions and conditions necessary to protect the birds, sea turtles, and other biota that are supported by scientific data and can make the Seashore home for part of the year. I believe the favor alternative (#7) advanced by the NPS is more restrictive than necessary to meet protection of the Seashore. I have read and agree with the proposal to manage ORV's on the Seashore prepared and submitted for consideration by the Coalition for Beach Access. My position is that the NPS accept this alternative or at least postpone a final decision on the ORV Plan pending further review and negotiation on the counter points raised by the Coalition for Beach Access.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3011    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.04,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** "I am a resident of North Carolina who enjoys recreational opportunities offered by the Cape Hatteras National Seashore and Recreational Area. Reasonable and safe pedestrian and vehicular access to the beach is essential to participate and enjoy these resources and opportunities. I also support restrictions and conditions necessary to protect the birds, sea turtles, and other biota that are supported by scientific data and can make the Seashore home for part of the year. I believe the favor alternative (#7) advanced by the NPS is more restrictive than necessary to meet protection of the Seashore. I have read and agree with the proposal to manage ORV's on the Seashore prepared and submitted for consideration by the Coalition for Beach Access. My position is that the NPS accept this alternative or at least postpone a final decision on the ORV Plan pending further review and negotiation on the counter points raised by the Coalition for Beach Access."  
 Thank you, Floyd J. Dilsaver

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3012    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.04,2010 07:08:46  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am a resident of North Carolina who enjoys recreational opportunities offered by the Cape Hatteras National Seashore and Recreational Area. Reasonable and safe pedestrian and vehicular access to the beach is essential to participate and enjoy these resources and opportunities. I also support restrictions and conditions necessary to protect the birds, sea turtles, and other biota that are supported by scientific data and can make the Seashore home for part of the year. I believe the favor alternative (#7) advanced by the NPS is more restrictive than necessary to meet protection of the Seashore. I have read and agree with the proposal to manage ORV's on the Seashore prepared and submitted for consideration by the Coalition for Beach Access. My position is that the NPS accept this alternative or at least postpone a final decision on the ORV Plan pending further review and negotiation on the

counter points raised by the Coalition for Beach Access.

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3013	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,04,2010 07:08:56						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>I was unable to attend the Raleigh public meeting on April 28th. Here are my comments:</p> <p>I grew up in Kinston NC, now live in Raleigh since 1971. For the last 23 years or so my family has gathered with 2 or 3 other families over Thanksgiving week to enjoy surf fishing and fellowship at Avon, Salvo, or Rodanthe. I have purchased several 4WD vehicles over the years in order to have access to better fishing spots, and to make it easier for my children and elderly parent to experience the beach and seashore. I have been a good steward of the resource, never violated a single fishing or ORV regulation. While fishing has been variously good or slow over those years we also enjoy the seashore.</p> <p>I believe the economic impact to the Outer Banks, and to merchants of vehicles, fishing gear, groceries and supplies will be permanently harmed by this proposal. My family, sadly, will not return to the CH beach if the privilege of beach driving is restricted.</p> <p>I also believe the arguments, science and statistics used by proponents of closing the beach are grossly inadequate, illogical, and one-sided. Please consider the the alternate proposals from the Coalition fro Beach Access as the better choice for citizens of the United States, to whom the CH National Seashore AND Recreation Area truly belongs.</p> <p>respectfully, Russ Turner</p>						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3014	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596		
<b>Name:</b>	N/A, N/A						
<b>Received:</b>	May,04,2010 07:08:59						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>Protecting our resources to maximize their ecological and economic benefit is a must for our state. In particular, finding some balance between access to, and preservation of, coastal fishing areas like the Cape Hatteras National Seashore and Recreational Area is crucial. Although reasonable and safe pedestrian and vehicular access to the beach is essential to (1) participate and enjoy these resources and opportunities and (2) promote economic sustainability and growth, consideration must be given to protecting plant, marine and animal life in the area.</p> <p>However, it is clear that alternative (#7) advanced by the NPS does not find the proper balance. Alternative #7 is more restrictive than necessary to meet protection of the Seashore and fails to consider other important factors like access and economic conditions.</p> <p>I agree with the more balanced proposal to manage ORV's on the Seashore submitted by the Coalition for Beach Access. The NPS should accept this alternative or at least postpone a final decision on the ORV Plan pending further review and negotiation on the counter points raised by the Coalition for Beach Access.</p>						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3015	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,04,2010 07:09:04						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	i support dare county's position on NPS DEIS plan for hatters and ocracoke.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3016	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596		
<b>Name:</b>	Tilley, William S						
<b>Received:</b>	May,04,2010 07:09:18						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>I am a resident of North Carolina who enjoys recreational opportunities offered by the Cape Hatteras National Seashore and Recreational Area. Reasonable and safe pedestrian and vehicular access to the beach is essential to participate and enjoy these resources and opportunities. I also support restrictions and conditions necessary to protect the birds, sea turtles, and other biota that are supported by scientific data and can make the Seashore home for part of the year. I believe the favor alternative (#7) advanced by the NPS is more restrictive than necessary to meet protection of the Seashore. I have read and agree with the proposal to manage ORV's on the Seashore prepared and submitted for consideration by the Coalition for Beach Access. My position is that the NPS accept this alternative or at least postpone a final decision on the ORV Plan pending further review and negotiation on the counter points raised by the Coalition for Beach Access.</p>						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3017	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596		
<b>Name:</b>	N/A, N/A						
<b>Received:</b>	May,04,2010 07:11:05						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>I am a resident of North Carolina who enjoys recreational opportunities offered by the Cape Hatteras National Seashore and Recreational Area. Reasonable and safe pedestrian and vehicular access to the beach is essential to participate and enjoy these resources and opportunities. I also support restrictions and conditions necessary to protect the birds, sea turtles, and other biota that are supported by scientific data and can make the Seashore home for part of the year. I believe the favor alternative (#7) advanced by the NPS is more restrictive than necessary to meet protection of the Seashore. I have read and agree with the proposal to manage ORV's on the Seashore prepared and submitted for consideration by the Coalition for Beach Access. My position is that the NPS accept this alternative or at least postpone a final decision on the ORV Plan pending further review and negotiation on the counter points raised by the Coalition for Beach Access.</p>						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3018	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596		
<b>Name:</b>	Cary, Lana L						
<b>Received:</b>	May,04,2010 07:15:25						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>To whome it may concern:</p> <p>I am a resident of Virginia who enjoys recreational opportunities offered by the Cape Hatteras National Seashore and Recreational Area. Reasonable and safe pedestrian and vehicular access to the beach is essential to participate and enjoy these resources and opportunities. I also support restrictions and conditions necessary to protect the birds, sea turtles, and other biota that are supported by scientific data and can make the Seashore home for part of the year. I believe the favor alternative (#7) advanced by the NPS is more restrictive than necessary to meet protection of the Seashore. I have read and agree with the proposal to manage ORV's on the Seashore prepared and submitted for consideration by the Coalition for Beach Access. My position is that the NPS accept this alternative or at least postpone a final decision on the ORV Plan pending further review and negotiation on the counter points raised by the Coalition for Beach Access.</p> <p>Thank you, Lana Cary</p>						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3019	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596		

**Name:** Alden, William  
**Received:** May,04,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** "I am a resident of North Carolina who enjoys recreational opportunities offered by the Cape Hatteras National Seashore and Recreational Area. Reasonable and safe pedestrian and vehicular access to the beach is essential to participate and enjoy these resources and opportunities. I also support restrictions and conditions necessary to protect the birds, sea turtles, and other biota that are supported by scientific data and can make the Seashore home for part of the year. I believe the favor alternative (#7) advanced by the NPS is more restrictive than necessary to meet protection of the Seashore. I have read and agree with the proposal to manage ORV's on the Seashore prepared and submitted for consideration by the Coalition for Beach Access. My position is that the NPS accept this alternative or at least postpone a final decision on the ORV Plan pending further review and negotiation on the counter points raised by the Coalition for Beach Access." For many years (back to the fourties) our family has enjoyed fishing on the Outer Banks please don't remove our access to our favorite fishing spots. We respect the beaches and the birds, fishes and other mammals that share this special place. Please look at the scientific evidence that we have very little effect on the beaches. Thanks William Alden - Apex, NC

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3020    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,04,2010 07:16:36  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** "I am a resident of North Carolina who enjoys recreational opportunities offered by the Cape Hatteras National Seashore and Recreational Area. Reasonable and safe pedestrian and vehicular access to the beach is essential to participate and enjoy these resources and opportunities. I also support restrictions and conditions necessary to protect the birds, sea turtles, and other biota that are supported by scientific data and can make the Seashore home for part of the year. I believe the favor alternative (#7) advanced by the NPS is more restrictive than necessary to meet protection of the Seashore. I have read and agree with the proposal to manage ORV's on the Seashore prepared and submitted for consideration by the Coalition for Beach Access. My position is that the NPS accept this alternative or at least postpone a final decision on the ORV Plan pending further review and negotiation on the counter points raised by the Coalition for Beach Access."

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3021    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,04,2010 07:24:14  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I wish to comment on the ORV Management plan for the Cape hatteras national Seashore.  
I live in Winston-Salem, NC which ia about a six hour drive to Cape Hatteras. There are plenty of other beaches in NC & SC I could visit which are closer. I choose Cape Hatteras because of the National Seashore.  
If the public is effectively banned from driving on the beach and enjoying the National Seashore then this will be a National Park that I will have no reason to want to visit. A very small minority of people will want to visit the park if they have to walk in 90 degree weather,dodge thunder storms, insects, carry their on water, cooler, chairs and umbrareels for shade to enjoy the park. I also enjoy fishing on the seashore and the advantage to fishing there is that you can easily move up and down the seashore in a SUV. If I have to stay in one spot then it will be much more convenient to just rent a house on the beach at some other beach.  
The National Parks where created so that the land could be preserved and enjoyed by the people. The People, means average citizens not enviromental extremist with extreme poltical agendas inwhich The People can enjoy the parks only in a manner that they agree with.  
I strongly support the Position Statement by the Dare County Comissioners which proposes reasonable protection for the National Seashore and resonable access for THE PEOPLE who love the parkwish to comment on the ORV Management plan for the Cape hatteras national Seashore.  
I live in Winston-Salem, NC which ia about a six hour drive to Cape Hatteras. There are plenty of other beaches in NC & SC I could visit which are closer. I choose Cape Hatteras because of the National Seashore.  
If the public is effectively banned from driving on the beach and enjoying the National Seashore then this will be a National Park that I will have no reason to want to visit. A very small minority of people will want to visit the park if they have to walk in 90 degree weather,dodge thunder storms, insects, carry their on water, cooler, chairs and umbrareels for shade to enjoy the park. I also enjoy fishing on the seashore and the advantage to fishing there is that you can easily move up and down the seashore in a SUV. If I have to stay in one spot then it will be much more convenient to just rent a house on the beach at some other beach.  
The National Parks where created so that the land could be preserved and enjoyed by the people. The People, means average citizens not enviromental extremist with extreme poltical agendas inwhich The People can enjoy the parks only in a manner that they agree with.  
I strongly support the Position Statement by the Dare County Comissioners which proposes reasonable protection for the National Seashore and resonable access for THE PEOPLE who love the park.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3022    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Mason, Kevin  
**Received:** May,04,2010 07:26:19  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am a resident of North Carolina who enjoys recreational opportunities offered by the Cape Hatteras National Seashore and Recreational Area. Reasonable and safe pedestrian and vehicular access to the beach is essential to participate and enjoy these resources and opportunities. I also support restrictions and conditions necessary to protect the birds, sea turtles, and other biota that are supported by scientific data and can make the Seashore home for part of the year. I believe the favor alternative (#7) advanced by the NPS is more restrictive than necessary to meet protection of the Seashore. I have read and agree with the proposal to manage ORV's on the Seashore prepared and submitted for consideration by the Coalition for Beach Access. My position is that the NPS accept this alternative or at least postpone a final decision on the ORV Plan pending further review and negotiation on the counter points raised by the Coalition for Beach Access.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3023    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** May,04,2010 07:27:41  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please make sure access is maintained to this valuable natural resource for all. While preserving natural flora and fauna is important it is the responsibility of those who manage the resource to balance preservation with access. Your salaries are paid by taxpayers so that you can manage the resource for all. Plied plovers while beautiful, contribute nothing the the taxbase or economy so lets develop a solution that is palatable for all!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3024    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,04,2010 07:30:30  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** The beach closure areas in Cape Hatteras have been excessive. In Sauble Beach Canada, where we have Piping Plovers successfully nesting, the closure areas are much smaller. A system of volunteers babysits the nest and young baby Plovers has resulted in successful breeding. Minimal impact on the public and a growth in the Plover population has resulted in widespread support of the program in Canada.

0009646

All the stakeholders here in Canada have been working closely together on a solution that works for the environment and people. Kiteboarders here have even been helping watch the Plovers. I hope you can come up with a measured response that protects peoples recreational activities and the environment too.

Best Regards,  
John Bryja

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3025	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596
<b>Name:</b>	Braun, J Richard				
<b>Received:</b>	May.04,2010 07:31:42				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>Please keep the beaches of Hatteras open.</p> <p>I love, protect, and utilize the beaches of the Outer Banks. I have been visiting the Outer Banks, and specifically Hatteras Island, my entire life. In my experience, those who use the beach tend to appreciate this fantastic natural resource and protect it by respecting the dunes, picking up trash, and "leaving only footprints".</p> <p>Hatteras Island, as a federal park, should continued to be enjoyed by the citizens of our nation. It's important that rules be maintained and followed in order to protect the environment, but not prohibition of use.</p> <p>God gave us these resources to respect, use and appreciate. This is what we shall continue to do.</p> <p>Aside from the natural right to utilize the beaches, maintaining access is critical to the economy of the Outer banks, which depends almost exclusively on those who come to visit the beaches.</p> <p>Please apply common sense to the entire issue of access to the beach and maintain access to the park. Anything else would be an overreaching restrictino of our freedoms and would pose economic hardship to many hard-working citizens/taxpayers and property owners.</p>				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3026	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596
<b>Name:</b>	Chappelear, Don				
<b>Received:</b>	May.04,2010 07:32:55				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>"I am a resident of Virginia who enjoys recreational opportunities offered by the Cape Hatteras National Seashore and Recreational Area. I have done so for over 50 years, due to the access available. Reasonable and safe pedestrian and vehicular access to the beach is essential to participate and enjoy these resources and opportunities. I also support restrictions and conditions necessary to protect the birds, sea turtles, and other biota that are supported by scientific data and can make the Seashore home for part of the year. I believe the favor alternative (#7) advanced by the NPS is more restrictive than necessary to meet protection of the Seashore. I have read and agree with the proposal to manage ORV's on the Seashore prepared and submitted for consideration by the Coalition for Beach Access. My position is that the NPS accept this alternative or at least postpone a final decision on the ORV Plan pending further review and negotiation on the counter points raised by the Coalition for Beach Access."</p>				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3027	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May.04,2010 07:33:09						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>Please don't restrict access to OBX beaches for watersports, I personally vacation there once a year to kiteboard &amp; surfing, i rent a large home and spend approx \$5000 each year in the local businesses. I certainly won't head there if kiteboarding is banned in any form. John Boone</p>						

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3028	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596
<b>Name:</b>	N/A, N/A				
<b>Received:</b>	May.04,2010 07:33:57				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>I am a resident of North Carolina who enjoys recreational opportunities offered by the Cape Hatteras National Seashore and Recreational Area. Reasonable and safe pedestrian and vehicular access to the beach is essential to participate and enjoy these resources and opportunities. I also support restrictions and conditions necessary to protect the birds, sea turtles, and other biota that are supported by scientific data and can make the Seashore home for part of the year. I believe the favor alternative (#7) advanced by the NPS is more restrictive than necessary to meet protection of the Seashore. I have read and agree with the proposal to manage ORV's on the Seashore prepared and submitted for consideration by the Coalition for Beach Access. My position is that the NPS accept this alternative or at least postpone a final decision on the ORV Plan pending further review and negotiation on the counter points raised by the Coalition for Beach Access.</p>				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3029	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596
<b>Name:</b>	Cary, Lana				
<b>Received:</b>	May.04,2010 07:36:40				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>An avid fisher woman and a strong supporter of environmental protections, I feel there must be a solution that offers compromise on both fronts. To close the beaches to vehicular traffic would prove to be extremely foolhardy and short-sighted.</p> <p>I have family who have lived on Hatteras Island for over 30 years. We have always driven the beach, reveling in the beauty and the solitude. Responsible use of our 4 wheel drives has always been a priority, and we leave the beach cleaner by the removal of trash and storm debris.</p> <p>There is no doubt about the economic devastation that would occur with the closure of the beaches to vehicular traffic. Homeowners and business owners would realize the loss of revenue, as those who frequent the Outer Banks specifically for the freedom to drive the beaches would most likely decline to visit.</p> <p>Large fishing tournaments would cease to exist. Participants in both the Hatteras Village and the Cape Hatteras Anglers Club tournament generate thousands of dollars in local revenue. Factor in the everyday angler who can no longer justify a visit to the Outer Banks and you've just eliminated thousands more. I know that I, on an individual basis, spend an average of \$1500 per year visiting the island. Multiply that by the number of disenfranchised beach-driving surf casters and you have a serious economic recession on your hands.</p> <p>Other beach users, such as surfers, bird watchers and the typical family "picnickers" are also contributors to the local economy. Surf shops, tackle stores, gas stations, groceries, gift shops, real estate companies, hotels, cottage owners.... There is no business that would go unscathed.</p> <p>I also worry that a sharp economic decline would imperil the construction of a new Oregon Inlet Bridge. If the tax dollars are removed from the system, where would these funds come from? There would certainly be less concern for the replacement. The residents of Hatteras and Ocracoke rely upon this bridge for everything from supply deliveries to hurricane evacuation. Closing the beaches would just delay the decisive action and funding needed for the islands' infrastructure that much more.</p> <p>I know the state of North Carolina has voiced its opposition to the proposed closures. The tax revenues generated by tourist dollars contributes greatly to the state coffers. Hatteras and Ocracoke may not be the only areas to feel the financial effect of beach closures: The neighboring towns to the north of Nags Head, Kitty Hawk, Duck and Corolla will also be impacted.</p> <p>When a locality has people who travel from as far away as Ohio and Canada to experience the uniqueness that is Hatteras Island, that says a lot. The reality is that the beaches of Hatteras and Ocracoke are the draw. There is no experience quite like gliding the sands, windows down, with the smell of the salt and the sea spray in one's face.</p>				

I feel that the use of a permit system to allow beach access may be the answer. Locals should not have to pay such a fee, or perhaps a sharply reduced fee. Permits could be purchased on daily/weekly/seasonally or yearly rate, much like a fishing license. Monies generated could be used to hire additional beach patrol personnel, cover the replenishment of beach grasses or sand, and provide educational opportunities. I would be more than happy to pay such a fee, if it could be properly used to create a balance of economic and environmental stability.

It is my hope that common sense will prevail, and that a way of life we have all known and loved will not change. However, it is up to all of us to voice our opinions and show that we are not selfish in our concerns, but are dedicated to finding a common ground (no pun intended) that will be of benefit to all. There is plenty of room for both birds and beach lovers among the sand and sea oats of these two beautiful islands.

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3030	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,04,2010 07:37:57						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I am a resident of North Carolina who enjoys recreational opportunities offered by the Cape Hatteras National Seashore and Recreational Area. Reasonable and safe pedestrian and vehicular access to the beach is essential to participate and enjoy these resources and opportunities. I also support restrictions and conditions necessary to protect the birds, sea turtles, and other biota that are supported by scientific data and can make the Seashore home for part of the year. I believe the favor alternative (#7) advanced by the NPS is more restrictive than necessary to meet protection of the Seashore. I have read and agree with the proposal to manage ORV's on the Seashore prepared and submitted for consideration by the Coalition for Beach Access. My position is that the NPS accept this alternative or at least postpone a final decision on the ORV Plan pending further review and negotiation on the counter points raised by the Coalition for Beach Access.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3031	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,04,2010 07:41:31						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	"I am a resident of North Carolina who enjoys recreational opportunities offered by the Cape Hatteras National Seashore and Recreational Area. Reasonable and safe pedestrian and vehicular access to the beach is essential to participate and enjoy these resources and opportunities. I also support restrictions and conditions necessary to protect the birds, sea turtles, and other biota that are supported by scientific data and can make the Seashore home for part of the year. I believe the favor alternative (#7) advanced by the NPS is more restrictive than necessary to meet protection of the Seashore. I have read and agree with the proposal to manage ORV's on the Seashore prepared and submitted for consideration by the Coalition for Beach Access. My position is that the NPS accept this alternative or at least postpone a final decision on the ORV Plan pending further review and negotiation on the counter points raised by the Coalition for Beach Access."						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3032	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,04,2010 07:47:39						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	"I am a resident of North Carolina who enjoys recreational opportunities offered by the Cape Hatteras National Seashore and Recreational Area. Reasonable and safe pedestrian and vehicular access to the beach is essential to participate and enjoy these resources and opportunities. I also support restrictions and conditions necessary to protect the birds, sea turtles, and other biota that are supported by scientific data and can make the Seashore home for part of the year. I believe the favor alternative (#7) advanced by the NPS is more restrictive than necessary to meet protection of the Seashore. I have read and agree with the proposal to manage ORV's on the Seashore prepared and submitted for consideration by the Coalition for Beach Access. My position is that the NPS accept this alternative or at least postpone a final decision on the ORV Plan pending further review and negotiation on the counter points raised by the Coalition for Beach Access."The needs of people need to come before birds.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3033	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	Phillips, Dean						
<b>Received:</b>	May,04,2010 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I am a resident of North Carolina who enjoys recreational opportunities offered by the Cape Hatteras National Seashore and Recreational Area. Reasonable and safe pedestrian and vehicular access to the beach is essential to participate and enjoy these resources and opportunities. I also support restrictions and conditions necessary to protect the birds, sea turtles, and other biota that are supported by scientific data and can make the Seashore home for part of the year. I believe the favor alternative (#7) advanced by the NPS is more restrictive than necessary to meet protection of the Seashore. I have read and agree with the proposal to manage ORV's on the Seashore prepared and submitted for consideration by the Coalition for Beach Access. My position is that the NPS accept this alternative or at least postpone a final decision on the ORV Plan pending further review and negotiation on the counter points raised by the Coalition for Beach Access.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3034	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,04,2010 07:49:29						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Whom it may concern, Please consider allowing ORV access on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. My family and I frequent the OBX and always do so as responsible adults. We teach our children the importance of taking care of our natural resources by example but would like to continue teaching on a first hand basis, on the Island, with unhindered ORV access. Thank you for this consideration						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3035	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,04,2010 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I am a resident of North Carolina who enjoys recreational opportunities offered by the Cape Hatteras National Seashore and Recreational Area. Reasonable and safe pedestrian and vehicular access to the beach is essential to participate and enjoy these resources and opportunities. I also support restrictions and conditions necessary to protect the birds, sea turtles, and other biota that are supported by scientific data and can make the Seashore home for part of the year. I believe the favor alternative (#7) advanced by the NPS is more restrictive than necessary to meet protection of the Seashore. I have read and agree with the proposal to manage ORV's on the Seashore prepared and submitted for consideration by the Coalition for Beach Access. My position is that the NPS accept this alternative or at least postpone a final decision on the ORV Plan pending further review and negotiation on the counter points raised by the Coalition for Beach Access. In addition, restricting access will also have a burden on the tourist and recreational fishing industry. These parks were set up by the government for the enjoyment of the citizens. Please do not prevent us from being able to visit and enjoy these areas.						

Thank you, Paul Carey

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3036    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,04,2010 07:53:16  
**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:** 3037    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,04,2010 07:53:22  
**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:** 3038    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,04,2010 07:53:49  
**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:** 3039    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,04,2010 07:53:55  
**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:** 3040    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,04,2010 07:54:02  
**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:** 3041    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,04,2010 07:55:21  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am a resident of North Carolina who enjoys recreational opportunities offered by the Cape Hatteras National Seashore and Recreational Area. Reasonable and safe pedestrian and vehicular access to the beach is essential to participate and enjoy these resources and opportunities. I also support restrictions and conditions necessary to protect the birds, sea turtles, and other biota that are supported by scientific data and can make the Seashore home for part of the year. I believe the favor alternative (#7) advanced by the NPS is more restrictive than necessary to meet protection of the Seashore. I have read and agree with the proposal to manage ORV's on the Seashore prepared and submitted for consideration by the Coalition for Beach Access. My position is that the NPS accept this alternative or at least postpone a final decision on the ORV Plan pending further review and negotiation on the counter points raised by the Coalition for Beach Access.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3042    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Ryan, Kevin  
**Received:** May,04,2010 07:56:48  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please fully open our beaches in the Cape Hatteras National Seashore!  
I find myself and my family having to work harder and harder just to keep up with everything that is going on. We work and study so hard during the year and really appreciate the little vacation time we can afford. Hatteras has been our little slice of heaven for over 25 years but it is getting harder to enjoy our beaches due to all the closures. Please consider the average Joe and his hard working family that really enjoys (or should I say really needs) ORV access to our public beach. We will continue to take care of our beach and the wildlife that lives there.  
Please provide open access and increase ORV access not reduce or eliminate access.  
Respectfully, Kevin Ryan

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3043 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Osborne, Terri K  
**Received:** May,04,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am a resident of Virginia who enjoys recreational opportunities offered by the Cape Hatteras National Seashore and Recreational Area. Our family has vacationed on Ocracoke Island 1 or 2 weeks a year for the last 30 years. We access the beach by ORV. We set up early in the morning and leave the beach late in the evening. During the day we enjoy fishing, swimming, boogie boarding, walking, collecting shells, kite flying, and simply enjoying Mother Nature at her finest. It would be impossible to move the amount of equipment we carry without ORV access. We believe reasonable and safe pedestrian and vehicular access to the beach is essential to participate and enjoy these resources and opportunities. We also support restrictions and conditions necessary to protect the birds, sea turtles, and other biota that are supported by scientific data and can make the Seashore home for part of the year. We believe the favored alternative (F) advanced by the NPS is more restrictive than necessary to meet protection of the Seashore. We have read and agree with the proposal to manage ORV's on the Seashore prepared and submitted for consideration by the Coalition for Beach Access. Our position is that the NPS accept this alternative or at least postpone a final decision on the ORV Plan pending further review and negotiation on the counter points raised by the Coalition for Beach Access.  
Terri and Dennis Osborne

**Correspondence ID:** 3044 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,04,2010 08:15:01  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am a disabled Vietnam Veteran. For years I have come to Hatteras and Ocracoke Island to surf fish and to enjoy the area. we spend about a thousand dollars there over the week we are visiting. It is money well spent. Since there is beach access for my ORV it is ideal for me to drive and park so I can fish. If I had to walk across the dunes carrying my gear it would make the effort too much and I would have to stop coming down there. Everyone loses. We are scrupulous in our obedience to the rules and regulations on the beaches and dunes and always leave the beach cleaner than we found it. Why are we being punished over some junk science and special interest group extremism? This is not what I fought for.

**Correspondence ID:** 3045 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,04,2010 08:16:33  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am a resident of North Carolina who enjoys recreational opportunities offered by the Cape Hatteras National Seashore and Recreational Area. Reasonable and safe pedestrian and vehicular access to the beach is essential to participate and enjoy these resources and opportunities. I also support restrictions and conditions necessary to protect the birds, sea turtles, and other biota that are supported by scientific data and can make the Seashore home for part of the year. I believe the favor alternative (#7) advanced by the NPS is more restrictive than necessary to meet protection of the Seashore. I have read and agree with the proposal to manage ORV's on the Seashore prepared and submitted for consideration by the Coalition for Beach Access. My position is that the NPS accept this alternative or at least postpone a final decision on the ORV Plan pending further review and negotiation on the counter points raised by the Coalition for Beach Access.

**Correspondence ID:** 3046 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,04,2010 08:19:44  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** this sea shore thrives on beach access and that is the way this Island's economy was built if you take it away, every business will suffer, you must find a way for wild life and people to co exists with out taking away beach access, until the keep the Beach open to vehicles, I vacation there and like to drive down the beach and surf fish just like thousands of others

**Correspondence ID:** 3047 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,04,2010 08:20:26  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** It appears to me that the NPS's preferred plan favors and gives preference to the ORV community and does not serve the interest or safety of visitors who wish to access the recreation area as a pedestrian or to be in an area that is motor-vehicle free. A mere 3.3 miles of beach out of the total for year round pedestrian only access is far from establishing an experience that is vehicle free. This is also very far from a compromise between user groups. This sort of unrestricted ORV use will greatly affect the experience of any visitor coming to enjoy the National Seashore in its natural state. If you think that somewhere down the road you might hope to change your stance, I can tell you from personal experience as a former NPS manager that once this concession is made to the ORV community, it will never be able to be taken back. I also fear that your decisions on this issue will have grave consequences for other NPS sites facing this same dilemma. Please minimize the amount of ORV access.

**Correspondence ID:** 3048 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Pope, Carl  
**Received:** May,04,2010 08:21:05  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** "I am a resident of North Carolina who enjoys recreational opportunities offered by the Cape Hatteras National Seashore and Recreational Area. Reasonable and safe pedestrian and vehicular access to the beach is essential to participate and enjoy these resources and opportunities. I also support restrictions and conditions necessary to protect the birds, sea turtles, and other biota that are supported by scientific data and can make the Seashore home for part of the year. I believe the favor alternative (#7) advanced by the NPS is more restrictive than necessary to meet protection of the Seashore. I have read and agree with the proposal to manage ORV's on the Seashore prepared and submitted for consideration by the Coalition for Beach Access. My position is that the NPS accept this alternative or at least postpone a final decision on the ORV Plan pending further review and negotiation on the counter points raised by the Coalition for Beach Access."

**Correspondence ID:** 3049 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,04,2010 08:24:19  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** "I am a resident of North Carolina who enjoys recreational opportunities offered by the Cape Hatteras National Seashore and Recreational Area. Reasonable and safe pedestrian and vehicular access to the beach is essential to participate and enjoy these resources and opportunities. I also support restrictions and conditions necessary to protect the birds, sea turtles, and other biota that are supported by scientific data and can make the Seashore home for part of the year. I believe the favor alternative (#7) advanced by the NPS is more restrictive than necessary to meet protection of the Seashore. I have read and agree with the proposal to manage ORV's on the Seashore prepared and submitted for consideration by the Coalition for Beach Access."

0009651

My position is that the NPS accept this alternative or at least postpone a final decision on the ORV Plan pending further review and negotiation on the counter points raised by the Coalition for Beach Access."

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3050	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,04,2010 08:26:11						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I am a resident of NC. I did attend the Ocracoke Presentation of the DEIS Draft. First off it should not take 800+ pages to define a reasonable plan. What is the impact of killing all the mammals on the beach to save the birds? If that is right we should kill all the whales and dolphins to get more fish. The allocated space is too large. It is unreasonable. You must remember this area is not the prime breeding area for these birds. We must have corridors to all areas. My thinking is to postpone a final decision on the ORV plan pending further review and negotiation the the counter points raised by the Coalition for Beach Access.						

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3051	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596		
<b>Name:</b>	Daniels, John A						
<b>Received:</b>	May,04,2010 08:26:49						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I disagree with the Alternative F restrictions as those are the most stringent restrictions available. NPS stated: "Visitor experience could be affected by conflicts between motorized and non-motorized recreation users.:(pg. vi) - Why has NPS never made public a list of reported incidents? In the last 10 years, there has only been 1 minor incident involving a stuck vehicle and a pededstrian was disclosed. the driver was not blamed by those involved, nor was he charged. I disagree with NPS statement: "Even with resource closures in place, protected species are still at risk[from pedestrians and ORVs]."(page 210) - There is no evidence that Piping Plover deaths have been attributed to ORVs. ORV violations continue to decrease as signage and education improve. Please do not close the beaches. It would be detrimental to the Hatteras Seashore and it's residents as the local economy depends on those fisherman that travel from near and far to fish their beaches. Thank you for your consideration in this matter.						

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3052	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596		
<b>Name:</b>	N/A, N/A						
<b>Received:</b>	May,04,2010 08:28:20						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I'm against your plans pertaining to the orv plans. The people that come to the islands enjoy the beach access. Thats one of the main reasons that people come there to spend their money on vacation. To take that away not only has an effect on the travelers but on the economy that the people living there depend on to support their families. I would reconsider the ideas of stopping the orv access to the beach. A significant drop in revenue would be overwelming to the locals that live on the outerbanks. Thanks for your time.....						

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3053	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,04,2010 08:34:01						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I have been visiting the Outer Banks and Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational area for more than 40 years. After reviewing the NPS DEIS I must disagree with any of the six alternatives within the document. All are excessively restrictive to ORVs and pedestrians without any proven science to back them. I have also reviewed the Coalition for Beach Access Position Statement signed by several groups that were a part of the negotiated rule making process and it by far succeeds in furnishing the best visitor experience while maintaining the needs of protecting the fragile resources. Please consider all aspects of this alternative and put people back into the management of Cape Hatteras National Seashore						

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3054	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596		
<b>Name:</b>	goschler, gary a						
<b>Received:</b>	May,04,2010 08:37:33						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Our family became familiar with hatteras through my father who in 1941 to 1945 would be in conveys that got torpedoed off the coast. the first time I visited the outer banks was 1959. Almost every year since I was old enough to drive I have spent my vacations here. Now my children enjoy the outer banks yearly. My wife and I have saved all our life and we planned to retire here. Now because of SPECIAL INTEREST GROUPS and a handful of wildlife that can easily be moved to local existing management areas, [Plus the relocation would be paid for by us taxpayers/vacationers anyway]. Im hearing that what I have enjoyed for 40 years is going to be taken away. my childrens children will only hear stories about what a peaceful, open, unpopulated beach is like. Plus everything I have been looking for In retirement is going to change. If beach closures happen our freinds and their families will suffer too. I don't understand how the Government can purposely put so many people out of business and cause this much hardship to so many. Im guessing I will have to retire at some other open beach! HUH. How can this still be called a national seashore if we cant enjoy it? No beach closures!						

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3055	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596		
<b>Name:</b>	Shackelford, Ronald						
<b>Received:</b>	May,04,2010 08:43:28						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I'm in favor of continuing the use of off-road vehicles at Cape Hatteras. I spend 6 wks a year here and the reason that I come to Buxston is that I can drive on the beach to fish. I have bad knees and cannot carry my gear across the dunes and cannot tolerate the wind. I can park my vehicle so that I am protected from the wind. I'm in favor with keeping some protected areas for birds but not closing off prime fishing areas like Cape Point. Also killing of local wildlife to protect birds is terrible. That must stop.						

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3056	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,04,2010 08:44:43						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I am a resident of North Carolina who enjoys recreational opportunities offered by the Cape Hatteras National Seashore and Recreational Area. Reasonable and safe pedestrian and vehicular access to the beach is essential to participate and enjoy these resources and opportunities. I also support						

restrictions and conditions necessary to protect the birds, sea turtles, and other biota that are supported by scientific data and can make the Seashore home for part of the year. I believe the favor alternative (#7) advanced by the NPS is more restrictive than necessary to meet protection of the Seashore. I have read and agree with the proposal to manage ORV's on the Seashore prepared and submitted for consideration by the Coalition for Beach Access. My position is that the NPS accept this alternative or at least postpone a final decision on the ORV Plan pending further review and negotiation on the counter points raised by the Coalition for Beach Access.  
Fred Saleeby phredfl1@yahoo.com

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3057    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,04,2010 08:47:54  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am a resident of North Carolina who enjoys recreational opportunities offered by the Cape Hatteras National Seashore and Recreational Area. Reasonable and safe pedestrian and vehicular access to the beach is essential to participate and enjoy these resources and opportunities. I also support restrictions and conditions necessary to protect the birds, sea turtles, and other biota that are supported by scientific data and can make the Seashore home for part of the year. I believe the favor alternative (#7) advanced by the NPS is more restrictive than necessary to meet protection of the Seashore. I have read and agree with the proposal to manage ORV's on the Seashore prepared and submitted for consideration by the Coalition for Beach Access. My position is that the NPS accept this alternative or at least postpone a final decision on the ORV Plan pending further review and negotiation on the counter points raised by the Coalition for Beach Access

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3058    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** fortune, william  
**Received:** May,04,2010 08:48:31  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** please keep the beaches open to ORV traffic .i owen a second home in AVON nc. and have been driving on the beaches for years . the orv drivers all the most environmentally conscious group out on the beach we love the outdoors and nature we have trash drives ,beach clean up days to clean up storm debris . and the econmic impact to hatteras island has already started an must be stopped

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3059    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** May,04,2010 08:48:34  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** "I am a resident of North Carolina who enjoys recreational opportunities offered by the Cape Hatteras National Seashore and Recreational Area. Reasonable and safe pedestrian and vehicular access to the beach is essential to participate and enjoy these resources and opportunities. I also support restrictions and conditions necessary to protect the birds, sea turtles, and other biota that are supported by scientific data and can make the Seashore home for part of the year. I believe the favor alternative (#7) advanced by the NPS is more restrictive than necessary to meet protection of the Seashore. I have read and agree with the proposal to manage ORV's on the Seashore prepared and submitted for consideration by the Coalition for Beach Access. My position is that the NPS accept this alternative or at least postpone a final decision on the ORV Plan pending further review and negotiation on the counter points raised by the Coalition for Beach Access."

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3060    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,04,2010 08:52:09  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** My husband and I own 3 different properties in Avon, NC and have always been committed to protecting the environment. We live on a farm and years ago dug a pond to catch the drainage from the fields before it drained into the river and then into the Chesapeake Bay. We also added filter strips that take away many acres of tillable land just to protect the river and Bay. I have not read all of the reports and studies on the beach closures, and could not tell you if there is anything that is objectionable or wrong in these studies, but I do know that many of these proposals are not fair to the citizens of Hatteras Island. I understand the need to protect endangered species. We on the Eastern Shore of Maryland went to great lengths to protect the endangered bald eagle, but I feel that it was done in a way that benefited both the eagle and the populace that lived where it lived. Small beach closures where the turtles nest and maybe small areas around where the birds nest is acceptable to most people, and most people respect those closed areas. But to close and restrict access to the beaches and hence the ocean to families, fishermen, and all citizens who enjoy what nature has provided us, is very unfair. The many miles of National Seashore that stretch between Oregon Inlet and all of the villages can provide many miles of beach for all species to nest. To punish citizens who have either spent their entire lives on the Island, or have moved and made their homes and businesses there, is incomprehensible. Our nation is in such economic trouble as it is, but to do this to the citizens and businesses of Hatteras Island would be devastating. We love Avon as we love our home, and as stated are committed to protecting what nature has provided us, but all within reason. There is a way that both humans and the species that inhabit Hatteras can live together. Most times nature will create it's own balance without human intervention. Please do not go to extremes and punish anyone who loves Hatteras Island and the way of life that it represents.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3061    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,04,2010 08:53:50  
**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.

Some humans and groups of humans are selfishly out of control. We have forgotten what is important. Everything is a circle and it is time to again take care of and respect all living things on this planet called 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:** 3062    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Stines, Kenneth C

**Received:** May,04,2010 08:54:59

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I would like to voice my concern of the restrictions trying to be placed on beach access, beach driving and enjoyment of our natural resources. I am a Hunter and Fisherman just like my Dad and his Dad and many more generations back. If it were not for outdoorsmen like my Dad and Grandfather they would be nothing to conserve today. Fishermen and Hunters are the true keepers of our great natural resources and would do nothing to harm or to help bring extinct any species. We can protect our natural resources and be good stewards of these great lands and still not infringe on the right of sportman to drive down the beach without restriction. A Hunter/Fisherman is the original and true protector of our natural resources, if you enjoy our nations parks, game lands and waterways you should be given thanks to the hunters and fisherman of the past instead of trying to take rights away from there kids to enjoy the same things that our ancestors worked so hard to protect for them to enjoy. Thanks C Kenneth Stines

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3063    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** DIXON, JR., WILLIAM H

**Received:** May,04,2010 08:59:01

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I HAVE LIVED IN NORTH CAROLINA MY ENTIRE LIFE EXCEPT FOR THE 4 YEARS I SERVED IN THE U.S. ARMY. DURING THOSE 4 YEARS I LIVED IN GERMANY FOR 2 YEARS. AS AN OUTDOORSMAN, I FOUND THE RESTRICTIONS ON LAND AND WATER USE IN GERMANY WERE SO RESTRICTIVE THAT ONLY THE WEALTHY COULD USE THE RESOURCE. IT MADE ME REALIZE THE FREEDOMS I HAD IN MY OWN COUNTRY. I NOW SEE THOSE FREEDOMS ERODING AT AN ALARMING RATE. TO HAVE TO BEG THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT TO USE A RESOURCE THAT MY FOREFATHERS USED IS ALMOST UNTHINKABLE TO ME. FISHING THE COASTAL AREAS OF NORTH CAROLINA IS A TRADITION AND PART OF MY CULTURE. HOOK AND LINE FISHERMAN DO NOT DEplete THE RESOURCE. WE EAT WHAT WE CATCH AND SPEND A LOT OF MONEY DOING IT. I WOULD SUGGEST IF YOU CLOSE THESE AREAS TO FISHERMAN YOU WILL SOON HAVE NORMALLY LAW ABIDING CITIZENS BECOMING CRIMINALS. IF IT WERE UP TO ME I WOULD TAKE THE OUTER BANKS BACK FOR THE PEOPLE OF NORTH CAROLINA. IF THE CITIZENS OF THIS STATE HAD KNOWN WHAT THIS PRESENT GOVERNMENT WAS CAPABLE OF THE OUTER BANKS WOULD BE A N.C. PARK AND NEVER A FEDERAL PARK. NO TRUE OUTDOORSMAN WANTS THE ENVIRONMENT ENDANGERED, BUT TO SAY ACCESS SHOULD BE ONLY LIMITED TO ANIMALS IS NOT RIGHT. WE IN THE SOUTH HAVE TRADITIONS WE HAND DOWN TO OUR SONS AND DAUGHTERS. WE TEACH THEM TO FISH AND TO HUNT. IT PUTS US CLOSER TO NATURE AND ALSO GIVES US AN APPRECIATION OF GOD'S WORK AND THE BEAUTY OF NATURE. DO WHAT YOU WISH BUT REMEMBER WE ARE A PROUD PEOPLE WHO HAVE FOUGHT FOR THEIR COUNTRY AND THEIR RIGHTS. WE WILL NOT GIVE THESE RIGHTS UP EASILY. RESPECTFULLY, WILLIAM HAROLD DIXON, JR.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3064    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,04,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am a resident of North Carolina who enjoys recreational opportunities offered by the Cape Hatteras National Seashore and Recreational Area. Reasonable and safe pedestrian and vehicular access to the beach is essential to participate and enjoy these resources and opportunities. I also support restrictions and conditions necessary to protect the birds, sea turtles, and other biota but only those which are clearly supported by unbiased scientific studies. I believe that Alternative (#7) advanced by the NPS is more restrictive than necessary to meet protection of the Seashore. I have read and agree with the proposal to manage ORV's on the Seashore prepared and submitted for consideration by the Coalition for Beach Access. I ask that the NPS consider accepting this alternative or at least postpone a final decision on the ORV Plan pending further review of "best use" alternatives which consider the needs of all Seashore user groups.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3065    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Jacobs, Steven B

**Received:** May,04,2010 09:04:45

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Mr. Murray,

I write in support of the Dare County DEIS Position Statement

As an entomologist trained in ecological principles, I wish to provide comment from the perspective of a professional biologist who enjoys the beaches of Ocracoke and appreciates the ORV accesses that are currently available. My experiences on those beaches have shown that the vast majority of ORV enthusiasts are surf fishers and they travel the beaches with respect for the ecosystem - wildlife in particular - and also for each other.

From 2002-2004 I was contracted by NPS to provide consulting services related to IPM procedures in many parks stretching from FIIS and WHHO to ZION and GRCA, and many locations in between. During this period I learned of the enormous pressures brought by environmental groups to, in essence, close many of our most beautiful areas to human traffic. In almost all of these instances there is little or no science to support the extreme environmental positions. However, the NPS sometimes buckles under the threat of lawsuits, and attempts to achieve consensus with these extreme positions.

I hope you will provide a balanced approach to managing your park that is science based, takes into account the livelihoods of the people who live in these locations, and rejects any position that is based on emotionalism.

Thank you for hearing my comments.

Respectfully submitted,

Steve Jacobs

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3066    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,04,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am a past resident of North Carolina, born in Wilmington, who still occasionally enjoys recreational opportunities offered by the Cape Hatteras National Seashore and Recreational Area. I strongly feel that reasonable and safe pedestrian and vehicular access to the beach is essential to participate and enjoy these resources and opportunities. I also support restrictions and conditions necessary to protect the birds, sea turtles, and other biota that are supported by scientific data and can make the Seashore home for part of the year. I feel that alternative (#7) advanced by the NPS is more restrictive

0009654

than necessary to meet protection of the Seashore. I have read and agree with the proposal to manage ORV's on the Seashore prepared and submitted for consideration by the Coalition for Beach Access. My position is that the NPS accept this alternative or at least postpone a final decision on the ORV Plan pending further review and negotiation on the counter points raised by the Coalition for Beach Access."

Bob Stearns Editor-at-Large SALTWATER SPORTSMAN Magazine

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3067	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,04,2010 09:09:54						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I am a resident of North Carolina who enjoys recreational opportunities offered by the Cape Hatteras National Seashore and Recreational Area. Reasonable and safe pedestrian and vehicular access to the beach is essential to participate and enjoy these resources and opportunities. I also support restrictions and conditions necessary to protect the birds, sea turtles, and other biota that are supported by scientific data and can make the Seashore home for part of the year. I believe the favor alternative (#7) advanced by the NPS is more restrictive than necessary to meet protection of the Seashore. I have read and agree with the proposal to manage ORV's on the Seashore prepared and submitted for consideration by the Coalition for Beach Access. My position is that the NPS accept this alternative or at least postpone a final decision on the ORV Plan pending further review and negotiation on the counter points raised by the Coalition for Beach Access.						

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3068	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,04,2010 09:13:02						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	these beaches are what makes nc one of the greatest states to live in. man and animal have lived there together and can continue to do so. so many lives depend on these areas for their living.						

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3069	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,04,2010 09:15:34						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I strongly favor alternative "F" as set forth by the NPS. In the interest of all who visit these seashore areas as pedestrians or by ORV, and those who seek to protect the area wildlife, the flexibility of this plan appears to best meet the objectives of all these parties. As admitted early in the document, the dynamic nature of the seashore needs to be considered in determining areas in which protection from human incursion is needed. Using rigid closing dates and larger-than-needed protection areas does not address these continuing changes, and can unnecessarily restrict useage of the seashore by visitors that have such an important economic impact on local people and businesses. On special interest concern I have on the issue is dogs on the beach. I do not take dogs there with me and strongly object to visitors who let their dogs run free chasing the wildlife. I would support setting up very limited areas, far from sensitive wildlife habitat for anyone wishing to have unrestrained dogs on the beach.						

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3070	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	Hoover, Vicki A						
<b>Received:</b>	May,04,2010 09:16:56						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Mr. Murray, Traveling from York PA to Ocracoke Island with my husband and family for 30 years, spending every extra money we had to be able to do this. 30 years ago we camped for one week, 10 years ago we were spending 6 weeks a year,two years ago we bought a small house in Avon that my husband and I can't afford to retire to, after 30 years at UPS and myself working as a legislative assistant to the local State Representative. 2 years ago my husband obtained his captains liscence for ferry employment and I was interviewed and promised a job at a large rental office as soon as we could sell our house. But then the closing of the beaches,less rentals, less ferry runs and no jobs. We are still in York waiting to move to Avon and now our dream might never happen. I was horrified recently when a beloved lady in York died at 96 and she had in her obituary to make memorial contributions to the SELC and the Audobon. She would be turning over in her grave if she newwhat these 2 organizations were trying to do to her beloved Outer Banks. She had been quite a flounder fisher woman. I know the comment is to be without emotion. Ive never seen 1 person inall my years go near or harm a turtle or bird. (1) The NPS should spend money on educating our children, with the programs to earn a seashore park badge that they stopped because of no money, but they have thousands of dollars to spend on thousands of signs to keep you away. The 1000 meter buffers have no science to justify them. (2) As many nutria as I have seen fishing over the years would be predators to plover eggs, not my fellow beach goers. Those islands off shore are great bird nesting areas predator free. (3) The seashore was designated many years ago as a recreation area for people. (4) Beach closures are devastating to the economy and life of the local people. (5)I was dumbfounded 3 years ago in the middle of the hook waiting for the ocean to hurl up another whelk. I was escortd out because the NPS was closing the beach in March in case a bird might nest. I was glad to go home to PA because they shut down the best shelling for as far as you could see. Sincerely Vicki Hoover						

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3071	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,04,2010 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	After reviewing the NPS DEIS I must disagree with any of the six alternatives within the document. I have; however, reviewed the 77 page Coalition for Beach Access Poaition Statement signed by several groups that were a part of the negotiated rule making process and it by far succeeds in furnishing the best visitor experience while maintaining the needs of protecting the fragile resources. Please consider all aspects of this alternative and put people back into the management of Cape Hatteras National Seashore.						

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3072	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,04,2010 09:23:06						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I believe we have enough laws in this country to go around the entire planet. Please leave Hatteras one of the last beaches in this country Free! Thank you, Doris C. Monticone						

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3073	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,04,2010 09:23:39						
<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:** 3074    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,04,2010 09:23:39  
**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:** 3075    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Latham, Judith C  
**Received:** May,04,2010 09:25:56  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** The DEIS fails to adequately justify why the surf zone doesn't qualify for Traditional Cultural Property designation. Long-term residents use the beach for many of the same cultural, recreational and religious activities done there by native Americans before the English first landed in CROATAN in the 1500's. The piping plover didn't arrive until 400 years later.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3076    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Branch, John E  
**Received:** May,04,2010 09:27:08  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am a resident of North Carolina who enjoys recreational opportunities offered by the Cape Hatteras National Seashore and Recreational Area. Reasonable and safe pedestrian and vehicular access to the beach is essential to participate and enjoy these resources and opportunities. I also support restrictions and conditions necessary to protect the birds, sea turtles, and other biota that are supported by scientific data and can make the Seashore home for part of the year. I believe the favor alternative (#7) advanced by the NPS is more restrictive than necessary to meet protection of the Seashore. I have read and agree with the proposal to manage ORV's on the Seashore prepared and submitted for consideration by the Coalition for Beach Access. My position is that the NPS accept this alternative or at least postpone a final decision on the ORV Plan pending further review and negotiation on the counter points raised by the Coalition for Beach Access

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3077    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Morris, James T  
**Received:** May,04,2010 09:36:10  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** The Hatteras Seashore was created for recreational use. There are lots of islands that many birds use to nest that do not have predators. The Park Service has hired someone to trap and kill hundreds of animals to protect a few birds. Open the beaches, the history shows that closing the beaches does not help the birds and it is a major economic hardship on the Outer Banks.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3078    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Cook, Kenneth L  
**Received:** May,04,2010 09:40:13  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I have fished the Outer Banks for the last 42 years using an off road vehicle. I have enjoyed and appreciated the opportunity to fish and use a vehicle on

the beach.

I have seen very little abuse of this resource during these many years. Over the years I have always seen fishermen police themselves and their peers. I have always found this group willing to do, help and preserve this privilege in any way they can.

Good people with good intentions will always prevail if given the opportunity. I hope you in your wisdom can see fit to let access to the beaches exist for ORVs.

Thank you  
Kenneth L. Cook

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3079    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,04,2010 09:42:52  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I would like to suggest that there be some provision for permitting of special vehicles for seniors over age 65. With the popularity of electric carts, utvs, and atvs, those with limited mobility can access areas without the use of heavy ORV's. Older individuals can and will handle lighter equipment, but not heavier vehicles.  
The above mentioned vehicles have been successfully used in sensitive areas and are proven to have an extremely light footprint. The NPS has experience with these vehicles as they have been used by the NPS to patrol the beach.  
While you have made provisions for persons covered by ADA, please do not forget those seniors that are healthy, but do not own or no longer have the stamina to handle large trucks and other ORV's. I think this age group will give you very little enforcement problems, especially if there is a specific permit process. Don't leave us out of your planning and help us continue to enjoy the outdoor experience as long as we can.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3080    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,04,2010 09:45:10  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am a resident of North Carolina who enjoys recreational opportunities offered by the Cape Hatteras National Seashore and Recreational Area. Reasonable and safe pedestrian and vehicular access to the beach is essential to participate and enjoy these resources and opportunities. I also support restrictions and conditions necessary to protect the birds, sea turtles, and other biota that are supported by scientific data and can make the Seashore home for part of the year. I believe the favor alternative (#7) advanced by the NPS is more restrictive than necessary to meet protection of the Seashore. I have read and agree with the proposal to manage ORV's on the Seashore prepared and submitted for consideration by the Coalition for Beach Access. My position is that the NPS accept this alternative or at least postpone a final decision on the ORV Plan pending further review and negotiation on the counter points raised by the Coalition for Beach Access.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3081    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,04,2010 09:47:11  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** "I am a resident of North Carolina who enjoys recreational opportunities offered by the Cape Hatteras National Seashore and Recreational Area. Reasonable and safe pedestrian and vehicular access to the beach is essential to participate and enjoy these resources and opportunities. I also support restrictions and conditions necessary to protect the birds, sea turtles, and other biota that are supported by scientific data and can make the Seashore home for part of the year. I believe the favor alternative (#7) advanced by the NPS is more restrictive than necessary to meet protection of the Seashore. I have read and agree with the proposal to manage ORV's on the Seashore prepared and submitted for consideration by the Coalition for Beach Access. My position is that the NPS accept this alternative or at least postpone a final decision on the ORV Plan pending further review and negotiation on the counter points raised by the Coalition for Beach Access."  
Sincerely, Ron Crammer

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3082    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Howell, Michael  
**Received:** May,04,2010 09:47:31  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am a resident of North Carolina who enjoys recreational opportunities offered by the Cape Hatteras National Seashore and Recreational Area. Reasonable and safe pedestrian and vehicular access to the beach is essential to participate and enjoy these resources and opportunities. I also support restrictions and conditions necessary to protect the birds, sea turtles, and other biota that are supported by scientific data and can make the Seashore home for part of the year. I believe the favor alternative (#7) advanced by the NPS is more restrictive than necessary to meet protection of the Seashore. I have read and agree with the proposal to manage ORV's on the Seashore prepared and submitted for consideration by the Coalition for Beach Access. My position is that the NPS accept this alternative or at least postpone a final decision on the ORV Plan pending further review and negotiation on the counter points raised by the Coalition for Beach Access."  
Sincerely,  
Michael Howell

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3083    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** May,04,2010 09:47:39  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Preserve and protect - NOT prohibit... PLEASE...!! Why does it have to be all or nothing..?

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3084    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,04,2010 09:49:25  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** To Whom it may concern...  
It saddens me that there is a chance that this wonderful area of your great country will possibly out of bounds for the general public. I have many fond memories of time spent there windsurfing and hopefully Kiting in the future. I would have to say that mostly all the water people that I have encountered on my visits which is around 9-10 times are the most enviromently conscious people on the planet. We are a people that are at one with and sympathize with nature. I think that isolating this region from the general public is wrong and that there must be a way that nature and the water people of the world can exist as one.WE truely look forward to our next visit to share all that this wonderful area has to offer. Thanks David Stewart

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3085    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private

**Received:** May,04,2010 09:50:47  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** "I am a resident of North Carolina who enjoys recreational opportunities offered by the Cape Hatteras National Seashore and Recreational Area. Reasonable and safe pedestrian and vehicular access to the beach is essential to participate and enjoy these resources and opportunities. I also support restrictions and conditions necessary to protect the birds, sea turtles, and other biota that are supported by scientific data and can make the Seashore home for part of the year. I believe the favor alternative (#7) advanced by the NPS is more restrictive than necessary to meet protection of the Seashore. I have read and agree with the proposal to manage ORV's on the Seashore prepared and submitted for consideration by the Coalition for Beach Access. My position is that the NPS accept this alternative or at least postpone a final decision on the ORV Plan pending further review and negotiation on the counter points raised by the Coalition for Beach Access."

**Correspondence ID:** 3086    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,04,2010 09:54:00  
**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:** 3087    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,04,2010 09:54:09  
**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:** 3088    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Tise, Stephen  
**Received:** May,04,2010 10:15:26  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I would like to express my concern about the proposed closure of many important spots to kite on Hatteras Island. Having traveled twice a year for kitesurfing over the last eight years I have personally seen what was once an activity that few engaged in has now become a very popular sport. Hatteras Island is one of only a few places that has enough room and conditions that make it an ideal location to learn. For the advanced riders it is certainly a major area, the sound and ocean surf are ideal terrain. I have had Four friends move their over the last 3-5 years. As full time residents, one purchased a house in Avon, another in Buxton specifically because they loves to kitesurf. These folks have pursued a lifestyle option that is as important as the access is. These people range from the age of 32 to 58. Needless to say they are significant year round residents that contribute both financially and culturally to the island. I fear major restrictions would spoil the quality and revenue from this sport. Major stake holders such as homeowners, restaurants, groceries stores, support services, shops etc would all suffer from an unduely and overly restricted policies that limit the access for kites, fisherman, beach goers etc. Management of the Island is obviously important for the sustainability of natural system. Having said that, serious emphasis and focus should target specific approaches that are sensible. Hatteras could easily screw up a good thing if the authorities take an approach that isnt collaborative.  
Good luck, I hope sensible people can come to decisions that informs good public policy that INCLUDES everyones concerns. Please, please dont take an overly restrictive stance, kiting is a perfect fit for hatteras; both financially and culturally.

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3089	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,04,2010 10:18:54						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>We have owned a rental cottage in Waves, NC for the past 6 years, and have been vacationing in the Outer Banks since the early 80's. The reason we made a substantial investment in this Waves property, is because of the beach access available on the beautiful beaches of Hatteras Island. Our rental income will be substantially affected if our rental guests lose access to Cape Hatteras National Seashore, and since we are retired here in Hertford, NC since 1999, we probably will not be able to handle our mortgage and owner expenses. In the current depressed real estate market, this will mean we will take a substantial loss for our investment if we are forced to sell. Beach access for our family and our rental guests could be severely limited and perhaps lost forever. This will have a devastating affect on Hatteras Island life, property values and business as we know it.</p> <p>We hope that you will reconsider your position and come up with a plan that will be amenable to all parties, and keep everything that makes Hatteras Island such a truly beautiful and special place.</p> <p>Sincerely, Arthur and Maria Rikstad</p>						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3090	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596		
<b>Name:</b>	Braack, James						
<b>Received:</b>	May,04,2010 10:21:32						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>I have recently had an opportunity to review the DEIS plan proposed by the National Park Service, and at best I am appalled at the lack of consideration for the citizens of this country as well as the local residents who feel the impact of this policy. When the legislation was originally introduced the people were guaranteed access in a way that was traditional to the area. I am now and always have been very concerned with the protection of the environment and all of the wildlife which is found there, but the steps being taken here are nothing short of draconian.</p> <p>The assumption that the species in need of protection cannot live in the same area as the people who use the area for recreation has absolutely no basis in peer-reviewed, scientific fact. I've spent many years on the beach fishing, some where I have walked in and some where I have driven. I have never seen any evidence of the different birds found there being disrupted by any of my activities. The fact of the matter is, they are just as likely to seek out the company of humans, if for no other reason than they are safer from predation when humans are around.</p> <p>One of the most over-looked facts in this discussion has been the fact that the Outer Banks in general do not constitute a major breeding or wintering ground for the plover. The majority of the breeding is far north of this area and the wintering grounds are generally further south. The devastating effect that the current closures are having on Hatteras and Ocracoke Islands are far outweighing the meager benefits of a few dozen plover chicks that have survived predation and adverse weather conditions over the past decade. The area is just not that important to the survival of the birds in question.</p> <p>Without adequate corridors through the recreation area and without reasonable protective areas of a size based on scientific evidence instead of wild speculation, the people who live and run businesses in the area are the ones that are endangered, not the birds.</p> <p>When the National Park system was established it was intended to save areas for future use by the people of this country. There is ample precedent for far less drastic regulation than what is presented here. This DEIS proposal is totally unacceptable to the citizens of this country.</p>						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3091	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,04,2010 10:22:05						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>We have owned a rental cottage in Waves, NC for the past 6 years, and have been vacationing in the Outer Banks since the early 80's. The reason we made a substantial investment in this Waves property, is because of the beach access available on the beautiful beaches of Hatteras Island. Our rental income will be substantially affected if our rental guests lose access to Cape Hatteras National Seashore, and since we are retired here in Hertford, NC since 1999, we probably will not be able to handle our mortgage and owner expenses. In the current depressed real estate market, this will mean we will take a substantial loss for our investment if we are forced to sell. Beach access for our family and our rental guests could be severely limited and perhaps lost forever. This will have a devastating affect on Hatteras Island life, property values and business as we know it.</p> <p>We hope that you will reconsider your position and come up with a plan that will be amenable to all parties, and keep everything that makes Hatteras Island such a truly beautiful and special place.</p>						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3092	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596		
<b>Name:</b>	N/A, N/A						
<b>Received:</b>	May,04,2010 10:30:08						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>You need to read Conrad Wirth's letter to the Island residents again, your proposed beach plan fails to provide free and open beach access to the public and it certainly will not help the villages to prosper and grow. The proposed treatment of the native wildlife is a disgrace, they have a right under the Enabling Legislation to exist in CHNSRA and were to be protected and preserved. The proposed ban on pets on the beach is outrageous and is without any merit. Why do you propose to close beach areas to the public for no reason at all, an example is the proposed closure from ramp 27 to ramp 30? Why are the proposed buffer zones and closure areas larger and more stringent than any where else on the East coast? Why is the beach being closed for non threatened or endangered species? Your plan F does not provide adequate beach access for the disabled and thus violates the law, an example is a single disabled would not be able to access the beach alone. You also fail to recognize the protection that an ORV provides the public, examples are wind,rain,heat or cold and lightning. Please go back to the interim plan, your proposal A.</p>						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3093	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,04,2010 10:37:02						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>I am a resident of North Carolina who enjoys recreational opportunities offered by the Cape Hatteras National Seashore and Recreational Area. Reasonable and safe pedestrian and vehicular access to the beach is essential to participate and enjoy these resources and opportunities. I also support restrictions and conditions necessary to protect the birds, sea turtles, and other biota that are supported by scientific data and can make the Seashore home for part of the year. I believe the favor alternative (#7) advanced by the NPS is more restrictive than necessary to meet protection of the Seashore. I have read and agree with the proposal to manage ORV's on the Seashore prepared and submitted for consideration by the Coalition for Beach Access. My position is that the NPS accept this alternative or at least postpone a final decision on the ORV Plan pending further review and negotiation on the counter points raised by the Coalition for Beach Access</p>						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3094	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596		
<b>Name:</b>	Sewell, Jim						
<b>Received:</b>	May,04,2010 10:41:03						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						

**Correspondence:** I am a resident of North Carolina who enjoys recreational opportunities offered by the Cape Hatteras National Seashore and Recreational Area. Reasonable and safe pedestrian and vehicular access to the beach is essential to participate and enjoy these resources and opportunities. I also support restrictions and conditions necessary to protect the birds, sea turtles, and other biota that are supported by scientific data and can make the Seashore home for part of the year. I believe the favor alternative (#7) advanced by the NPS is more restrictive than necessary to meet protection of the Seashore. I have read and agree with the proposal to manage ORV's on the Seashore prepared and submitted for consideration by the Coalition for Beach Access. My position is that the NPS accept this alternative or at least postpone a final decision on the ORV Plan pending further review and negotiation on the counter points raised by the Coalition for Beach Access.  
Jim Sewell

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3095    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,04,2010 10:41:30  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I have been visiting the Hatteras Village area for going on 35 years and object to the way we are attempting to close down the beaches. One of my major interest in coming down is to surf fish and enjoy the solitude and beauty of the area. Closing down the beaches will more than likely cause me to find areas other than Hatteras to spend my vacations and weekends. I understand that in some very small way we are having some very samll effect on the habitat but a major effect on the humans. This will strangle the economy of this area and put a major hardship on humans. I think that is much more important than trying to save a few birds that will continue to nest. I saw this type of action down below Sandbridge Va. The entire beach area and the homes on were shutdown but to what end..... The human factor and the revenue that Hatteras brings into the area is critical.....

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3096    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,04,2010 10:53:51  
**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:** 3097    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,04,2010 10:53:52  
**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:** 3098    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,04,2010 10:53:52  
**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:** 3099    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,04,2010 10:53:56  
**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:** 3100    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,04,2010 10:54:05  
**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:** 3101    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,04,2010 10:58:19  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As a surf fisherman and a birder the proposed restrictions to our National Seashore are not user friendly. Corridors along the seashore for ORV do not seem to bother the nesting birds and those flushed (birds feeding in the surf) continue to use the beach that are occupied by humans/vehicles. Since they are winged creatures, some choose the uninhabited islands offshore. My observations in the fall/winter, the piping plovers feed among my pole holders

while I surffish, they don't seem the least bothered. Nesting sea turtles however are a different issue. Currently small enclosures work Issues: - Alternative F restrictions far exceed those under the Consent Decree, the Interim Mgmt Strategy, and the de facto ORC plan previously in place under Superintendent's Order #7 - Restrictive Species Mgmt Areas (p.468) - ML1 and ML2 are overly restrictive, the Coalition suggestions are fair and reasonable - Buffer zones (p.121-127) are larger than those endorsed by Coalition; I love that the wildlife is protected but I want to SEE and ENJOY them like we have always been allowed; human impact is the least of their worries (3%= insignificant impact) - NPS does not adequately consider locations neighboring the Recreational Area that are part of the same ecosystem (ie. dredge and spoil islands, Pea Island NWR); we need to include the WHOLE PICTURE! - NPS inadequately addresses environmental issues more detrimental to turtle recovery success than ORVs or Pedestrians (p.392-396) ie. weather events, light pollution, ghost crab predation - Region of Influence (ROI) incorporates the Northern Beach communities which dilutes estimates of economic impact on the Seashore Villages and should not be included; Like any analysis, you can make the numbers show what you want by manipulating the data; USE COMMON SENSE - Overall Visitor Counts - use of data in locations such as the Wright brothers National Memorial are not the people with ORVs or even beach goers; again manipulation of data to make the statement you want - Pets: since 85% of the population has a pet, prohibiting them from public areas any time would be a socioeconomic crisis therefore the Coalition position of using a 6' leash year-round in all areas open to pedestrians and ORVs is acceptable

I know regulating and enforcing laws is expensive and the more restrictions we add, the harder it is to oversee BUT most of us that use the National Seashore are unofficial enforcers and will always help. Please don't take the National Seashore away from the people. We let the National Wildlife Refugees restrict us enough so let us have our Recreational areas within reason. Thank you, Audrey Whitlock and husband Robert Halstead -

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3102	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,04,2010 11:09:41						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	As a property owner, tax payer and U.S Citizen my family and I have enjoyed the use of Hatteras Island.. I am shocked and appalled the U.S Government is attempting to restrict, limit and/or prohibit use of the beach that is owned by the U.S Citizens. Hatteras Island has many dedicated areas including Pea Island for Wildlife. This restriction will destroy tourism and cost the loss of additional jobs which the Country cannot afford. Please wake-up and smell the coffee, where does the money come to pay for your jobs. TAX dollars paid by us. Regards, Kenneth D. Johnston						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3103	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	
<b>Name:</b>	Chatwin, Mark S						
<b>Received:</b>	May,04,2010 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I am a regular visitor to Rodanthe in the Outer Banks of NC for the purpose of family vacationing and kitesurfing/windsports. Being truthful I was ignorant to the impact that activities on the beaches would have to wildlife and particularly the nesting habits of birds. My family and I just want to have fun in the water. But I now can see there is more to it... Seeing that my vacation activities impose a real detrimental impact on wildlife I support Plan C as a compromise in continuing to enjoy the Outer Banks with our vacation activities albeit with certain limitations to preserve wildlife. Thanks you.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3104	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,04,2010 11:23:03						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I am a longtime Surfrider Foundation member, Ocean City, MD and National Capitol Chapters, supporting member of the Delaware Chapter and a longtime supporter of the Rincsn, Puerto Rico Chapter. I disagree with the Surfrider Foundation position supporting Alternative C, and support the NPS-preferred Alternative F, as the best means to balance and manage recreational user and wildlife interests in this national recreational area (not to be mistaken with a National Wildlife Refuge area).						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3105	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,04,2010 11:23:48						
<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>	3106	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	
<b>Name:</b>	Dean, Thomas J						
<b>Received:</b>	May,04,2010 11:41:02						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I will be more likely to spend my vacation/Weekend/fishing dollars elsewhere if beaches are closed!! When on the Island, I notice people are respectful to the beaches and it is managed well. I don't understand why a JEEP can't put its footprint in the						

sand and we will be drilling for oil off the shore??

As far as the bird thing goes with closing the beach access: It is ridiculous, the birds can nest in tons of places.... Not just beach.

What is the difference from a car on the road to a 4 wheel drive vehicle on the sand? More animals are killed by being hit by a car driving on the road!!!!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3107    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Kellum, Amy D  
**Received:** May,04,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. We ask that any plan that is approved will do the following:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families 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. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for your consideration. Amy Kellum

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3108    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,04,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** While we are using a comment supplied by the Coastal Fisheries Reform Group, we have done so because it expresses our opinion and beliefs most excellently.  
"I am a resident of North Carolina who enjoys recreational opportunities offered by the Cape Hatteras National Seashore and Recreational Area. Reasonable and safe pedestrian and vehicular access to the beach is essential to participate and enjoy these resources and opportunities. I also support restrictions and conditions necessary to protect the birds, sea turtles, and other biota that are supported by scientific data and can make the Seashore home for part of the year. I believe the favor alternative (#7) advanced by the NPS is more restrictive than necessary to meet protection of the Seashore. I have read and agree with the proposal to manage ORV's on the Seashore prepared and submitted for consideration by the Coalition for Beach Access. My position is that the NPS accept this alternative or at least postpone a final decision on the ORV Plan pending further review and negotiation on the counter points raised by the Coalition for Beach Access."  
Sincerely, Andrew and Susan Davenport

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3109    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Lighthart, Myra  
**Received:** May,04,2010 11:47:42  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** It is my feeling that nature/environment should always take precedence over special interest groups. I have seen the damage done by driving off road and would hate to see it allowed on the beaches which have enough problems already with the high population of tourists. I hope driving on beaches is not allowed in any form.  
thanks,  
Myra lighthart

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3110    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Valdmets, Lisa  
**Received:** May,04,2010 11:49:26  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please preserve Cape Hatteras seashore for it's wildlife and natural beauty. There are enough roads in North Carolina and let the people drive their cars and trucks on roads not beaches. If folks want to fish they can walk and get some exercise at the same time. It's a national seashore that should be protected and preserved for future generations not driven over like so many miles of asphalt. Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3111    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Colburn, Joan  
**Received:** May,04,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the 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 ask that any plan that is approved will do the following:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families 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. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent

0009663

degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.?

Please protect this amazing resource for this and future generations. Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3112    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,04,2010 11:54:26  
**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. This plan serves the greater good and larger public numbers than the allowing of vehicles on the beach which serves only a selfish few.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3113    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,04,2010 11:54:58  
**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:** 3114    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Weiss, Sally  
**Received:** May,04,2010 11:55:18  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am, quite frankly, opposed to allowing any off-road vehicles on National Seashore lands--with the possible exception of allowing extremely close to, or actual on-the-beach access for people with physical (mobility, heart or other significant condition that makes walking difficult or impossible) disabilities. Otherwise, parking within easy walking distance would be my strongly preferred option.  
Our Outer Banks and Cape Hatteras beaches are fragile; the wildlife are threatened or endangered; there is no reason that I can see to allow use of ORV's to further damage or erode our beaches.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3115    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,04,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Hello, Thank you for soliciting feedback on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
I ask that any plan that is approved will do the following:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

0009664

I advocate that ORV use be banned, and only pedestrian and bicycle access be permitted on the beach. Pedestrians and cyclist access only would provide a quiet, peaceful place to experience nature and to support wildlife recovery. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.?  
Thank you for your consideration and time.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3116	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596
<b>Name:</b>	Smith, Michael D				
<b>Received:</b>	May,04,2010 12:01:42				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please do not restrict access to the beaches in Hatteras. This area is one of the worlds best for watersports and any closure would be devastating to numerous local businesses. I am one of thousands of people who make an annual pilgrimage to the Outer Banks and spend a lot of money while I'm there. Close the beach and we wont be back!				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3117	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596
<b>Name:</b>	N/A, N/A				
<b>Received:</b>	May,04,2010 12:03:48				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I used to go to the outer banks all of the time, and we enjoyed driving and fishing at Hatteras. Unfortunately it has turned into a parking lot and you can't even get a line in the water most times during the year. Maybe if they closed it to vehicles, more people could go out there and fish or just enjoy the ocean. It would also keep the wildlife safe and cause less erosion.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3118	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596
<b>Name:</b>	N/A, N/A				
<b>Received:</b>	May,04,2010 12:04:25				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I sincerely hope that you will protect the Cape Hatteras shoreline from off-road vehicles as much as possible. My husband and I vacationed on the Outer Banks a few years ago and we were saddened by how much the beaches were ugly and damaged with oil and wheel marks from the vehicles. I'm grateful for your attention to this.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3119	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,04,2010 12:04:59						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	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. We all deserve equal access and a safe space on a national park beach. As a frequent visitor to the area who enjoys birding along the barrier islands, I often shop in the local grocery stores, eat at the local restaurants, and stay in the local hotels during outings with friends. Tourism comes in many forms and does not require driving on the beach.						

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3120	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,04,2010 12:06:23						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	As someone who grew up loving to visit our lovely outer bank beaches, I do not want to see them mutilated by motorized vehicles! Please do everything possible to prohibit any form of motorized vehicle on as much of the beach area as is possible. Our beaches are meant to be peacefully enjoyed by everyone and those enjoying their peace and tranquility should not have to endure the noise and obnoxiousness of loud motor driven machines. Most of those wanting to use such devices have shown that they have no concern for the welfare and protection of our beautiful beaches. They seem to be only concerned with their immediate and short lived pleasure at the expense of others. Please protect our beaches from motorized terrorists and conserve them for future generations to enjoy. Thank you for this opportunity to express my opinion. Jim Phelps						

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3121	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596
<b>Name:</b>	Miller, John M				
<b>Received:</b>	May,04,2010 12:06:37				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	The issue of beach access has become too polarized. Nothing good can come when two environmentally conscious groups see each other as adversaries. The birds and turtles use less than 5 percent of the total beach area. Surely, with all the interest in both, nesting could be tracked and those specific areas marked off limits to traffic. Closure of large areas of beach means the managers are just too lazy to do the proper assessments.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3122	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596
<b>Name:</b>	Sutherland, Daniel M				
<b>Received:</b>	May,04,2010 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Keep the beaches open and maintain our way of life.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3123	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596
<b>Name:</b>	N/A, N/A				
<b>Received:</b>	May,04,2010 12:10:05				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I strongly support keeping our beaches open!!				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3124	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------	-----------------	---

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,04,2010 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 ask that any plan that is approved will do the following:  
 Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families 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. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
 Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
 It seems logical that any sustainable, efficient plan can and would include these different ideas. This is completely feasible and necessary. I look forward to a successful outcome. Thank you for your time.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3125    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** May,04,2010 12:14:32  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please keep our beaches free of traffic- no cars, no trucks, no ATVs; they are harmful for the wildlife and leave pollution behind. Thank you!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3126    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,04,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. Also, I would ask that any plan that is approved will do the following:  
 Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. - If 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 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.  
 Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until 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 brag about the beauty and quality of North Carolina's beaches to everybody; please preserve and protect the reasons that I have for doing so. thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3127    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** martin, billy g  
**Received:** May,04,2010 12:17:30  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please restrict the driving of any vehical on the beach in Hatteras Park.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3128    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Bayes, Ronald H  
**Received:** May,04,2010 12:19:01  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** North Carolina yet has some of the most wonderful public beaches in America. But they won't stay wonderful unless we the people, and the government, remain diligent in seeing to it.  
 I have seen beaches in Florida and New Jersey, for instance, that might as well have been paved over. The vehicles and the people behind their wheels had (and often still do) let lack of diligence and lack of concern abet their essential dying.  
 We still have time to prevent this and we must.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3129    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,04,2010 12:21:56  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** as a native North Carolinian i am hoping and praying that you will ensure that the beaches of NC are vehicle-free.  
 there is not a vehicle out there (that i know of) that the average person drives that doesn't emit or leak something harmful to the shores and/or water and air.  
 the LAST thing that should be allowed on the beaches are polluters...2 footed or 4 wheeled.  
 PLEASE protect. as we have seen in the Gulf it sure is much harder to contain that it is to avoid the possible catastrophe.  
 thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3130    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,04,2010 12:23:53  
**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:** 3131    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,04,2010 12:24:10  
**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:** 3132    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,04,2010 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 ask that any plan that is approved will do the following:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families 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. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best 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:** 3133    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,04,2010 12:29:06  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National 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 users represent only a small percent of the total users of the area. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half, or better, 75% of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families 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 should try to preserve the wildlife found in the park, because they are gone, it will be hard to nearly impossible to bring them back. We should think of the future also, and leave a legacy to the future generations.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3134    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Long, Kathleen M

**Received:** May.04,2010 12:32:28  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** To whom it may concern, It is IMPERATIVE that the Cape Hatteras National Seashore remain open and accessible to all who use it for recreational and business (i.e., fishing, boating, sporting, etc.) purposes. We own a house on the ocean, and have already been devastated by shrinking property values and the poor economy! We can NOT afford to have restricted accessibility to the beaches ruin our rental income. I find it hard to believe that up and down the east and west coasts of this great country, tourists can enjoy the beautiful beaches and towns can thrive on tourism business, except on Hatteras Island. It is completely unfair to change beach access and designations AFTER we have purchased property and other people have established businesses. There is no reason for this; the beaches and wildlife are NOT endangered. This is simply one more way that government is seeking to control our lives. PLEASE do NOT allow such restrictions to be enforced. As it is, we are becoming a nation of regulations! What happened to the freedom to enjoy this great land of ours?!  
Thank you! Kathleen Long

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3135    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Crews, Agnes K  
**Received:** May.04,2010 12:33:27  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I believe the primary purpose of a national park is to preserve the natural wonders of the area for all to enjoy. To achieve the balance in nature the final plan should strengthen: (1) wildlife protections year-round to include migrating and wintering species (2) recovery goals for threatened and endangered species. (3) equal access to the beach for all users that will not take away from this sought after balance (4) and support wildlife and people management based on the best available science as well as on common sense.  
Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the important decision.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3136    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.04,2010 12:37:37  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I have been going to Cape Hatteras, NC since the 1960's. I have enjoyed the relaxed and open spaces for all these years and would like you to keep the beaches open for everyone to enjoy. The park rangers have always followed the rules that had been set in place as well as the visitors. The environmental people have pushed too hard to close our beaches without any concern for the visitors or the businesses that have been on the island for many years. The environmental people have the money to sway your votes, which is not why you originally went into politics. Please keep in mind that the public needs to be able to go to Hatteras, NC to relax, fish and enjoy the open spaces so we can go back to work after vacation refreshed and keep paying our taxes and keep you in business.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3137    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Brown, Deb  
**Received:** May.04,2010 12:38:11  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please support a plan that will protect the natural beauty of our Cape Hatteras National Seashore and protect our shore from DRVs.  
Please protect our public and natural beaches from excessive beach driving.  
Thank you!  
Sincerely,  
Deb Brown

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3138    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Ricks, Linda M  
**Received:** May.04,2010 12:39:17  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As a taxpayer of the State of North Carolina, I feel that I, at least, should have a say in this..I have grandchildren now that I would like to think would have access to this area in a safe manner..also for all the other families that would like to enjoy the beauty of nature without fear of being run over by vehicles..there are not many beaches left that are concerned for the wildlife habitation or environment..you can just go on the internet and see all the nature trails that have been completely ruined by ORV's..I fear for young children or even the elderly who would like to visit the beach..some of these vehicles are not driven properly..a young foreign exchange student was killed on Ocracoke Island a few years ago due to alcohol related poor driving..please take this in consideration when coming to a vote..I'm not anti-ORV's but feel there is a place for them and not on a federal beach that should be for all people..thank you for your time and attention to this comment.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3139    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.04,2010 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. We ask that any plan that is approved will do the following:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families 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. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3140    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A

**Received:** May,04,2010 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. We ask that any plan that is approved will do the following:

Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families 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. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until 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 are essentially a destructive nuisance in Park Service areas. They waste gasoline, create pollution, disturb wildlife and people on foot.

**Correspondence ID:** 3141    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Dalton, Nicole W

**Received:** May,04,2010 12:41:18

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** We need to preserve our natural treasures, of which the Cape Hatteras National Seashore is one of them. Please consider restricting driving on its beaches to preserve them as a habitat for sea shore animals and also for future generations.

**Correspondence ID:** 3142    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,04,2010 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. We ask that any plan that is approved will do the following:

Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families 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. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

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

Frankly, I think it's embarrassing for the state of North Carolina that we allow so much driving on the beach. I've lived in many coastal areas over the course of my life so far, and I don't recall any permitting cars on the beach at any time. It's the antithesis of what a beach is about, to me. I know there are plenty of people who do it, but I really think it's inappropriate, both because of the wildlife impact and because it makes it an unpleasant place to visit. Thanks.

**Correspondence ID:** 3143    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Hamilton, Richard B

**Received:** May,04,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Coastal Fisheries Reform Group (CFRG) Position DEIS ORV Plan for Cape Hatteras National Seashore and Recreational Area  
The Cape Hatteras National Seashore and Recreational Area (RA) was established in 1937 to protect the fragile and valuable outer strand of barrier beach from Nags Head to Ocracoke and to provide recreational opportunities for all US citizens. The RA has become a very popular destination for all kinds of vacationers and serves as a strong economic stimulus to the area. The Off Road Vehicle (ORV) Plan being developed by the National Park Service (NPS) must consider the importance of continuing adequate public access to the RA as equal to the continued welfare of the indigenous animal and plants that live there. The CFRG, which is composed of over 1,000 members who are active and committed recreational fishermen and women, believes the two objectives are compatible. To this end we submit our comments regarding the DEIS.

The CFRG has studied the Alternative #7 favored by the NPS and finds it to be more restrictive than necessary to protect the birds, reptiles, and plants native to the area. We believe the closures to ORVs and pedestrians are too extensive in area and too long in duration than what is necessary to protect the nesting birds and turtles. We believe alternatives exist that, while possibly a little more expensive for the NPS to implement, would do the job as well without over burdening the visiting public. There is very little evidence that ORV traffic or pedestrians are having a significant adverse impact on native fauna and flora. The CFRG takes the position that the NPS should delay final decision on the DEIS until after all responses are carefully considered and should incorporate elements of the public comments into the Final Plan that would ameliorate the severe restriction of access contained in Alternative #7.

CFRG has also carefully reviewed the alternative plan developed and offered by the Beach Access Coalition. We find the greatest part of this alternative approach to contain significant merit and to be based upon history, tradition, evidence, and common sense, tempered with the desire to protect the native fauna and flora as proven necessary. CFRG recommends that NPS carefully consider the alternative presented by the Beach Access Coalition and incorporate the elements of that plan that meet the test of providing convenient and adequate public access to the beach and other popular sites on the RA while providing basic security measures for the fauna and flora that are supported by studies on the RA into the Final Plan.

Submitted on May 4, 2010 Coastal Fisheries Reform Group

**Correspondence ID:** 3144    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,04,2010 12:53:42  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I disagree with DEIS plan. Our beaches and access to them is critical to the economic stability of the Outer Banks. More patrols of these areas by the Parks Service could be a better way to manage these areas and allow access and control to co-exist.

**Correspondence ID:** 3145    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,04,2010 12:54:03  
**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:** 3146    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,04,2010 12:54:28  
**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:** 3147    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Leavitt, Robert  
**Received:** May,04,2010 12:57:59  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I have been travelling to the Outer Banks since 1962. As a child my parents took me to Hatteras Island because they loved the unspoiled natural beauty of the place and the opportunity to be on the beaches.  
In the past few years access to the beaches has clearly been restricted and the results of these restrictions have had a negative impact on those who have come to know the National Seashore. And it is clear that the restrictions are not resulting in a direct positive impact on some of the species that the restrictions are intended to protect. Additionally, it is unconscionable that so many other animals have been destroyed in order to protect some species of little consequence.  
In my opinion the process and the results are clearly suspect relative to the advertised advantages.  
At a minimum, the closures should be mitigated my routes of access that will permit people to get to sections of the beach that would otherwise be isolated by the closures.  
The restricted areas should also be reduced so that there is a scientific basis for the closure and not just the idealized vision of some conservationists.  
I own a home on Hatteras Island. My sense is that the proposals hardly address the rights of the landowners and visitors that populate the Island. I am an advocate of conservation and believe that most of the people that come to the Island do so because of the natural surroundings. Thier stewardship of these resources is demonstrated in the way they interact with the environment and the overwhelming experiences has been favorable. Now, influences outside of the Island population seek to define the rules and this invasion is not based on science alone.  
I strongly object to the limitations of the proposals and find that the interests of all have not been incorporated into this plan. Like the hearty settlers that first came to this Island I will vigorously defend my right to access the beaches of the place that I love whatever that requires.  
Robert Leavitt

0009670

**Correspondence ID:** 3148    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,04,2010 12:58:07  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am an avid kitesurfer and often go on vacations to kitesurf. Friends have been telling me about the Hatteras National Seashore area and I want to go there to kitesurf. However, if you close access none of us will be going there for vacation/kitesurfing. Kitesurfing is a benign sport to nature - 99.9% of the time one is skimming across the top of the water under wind power. And when we are not moving, we are wading or floating in the water waiting for a puff of wind to get us going again. Please don't close access to kitesurfers in your areas

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3149    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Devore, James W  
**Received:** May,04,2010 12:58:23  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As a person who does not own an off road vehicle I am astonished by the opportunities offered to a group that shows so little regard for the natural beauty and valuable assets of our coast. The overwhelming majority of those who want to be able to drive on the beach are "sportsmen." I use that term loosely since the majority of them just don't want to haul their equipment and beer all the way from the parking area. When it's cold they can sit in their trucks and wait for the fish to bite with the motor running and be warm. When it's hot they sit in their trucks and wait for the fish to bite with the motor running and be cool. Of course they can smoke all the time and throw their butts right in the ocean with the rest of the trash that they accumulate (cans, bottles, wrappers, bait containers, garbage, dead fish and parts of fish when they are done cleaning them). This is supposed to be a place to enjoy the natural wonders not a place to have to be careful that you don't step on a bunch or bait or fish guts or worse. I might emphasize for ocean fishermen that their are few restrooms and plenty of beer. Allowing the vehicles on the beach just promotes the man-made ruin of the seashore for any other visitors but even worse it helps destroy the homes of all the birds, as well as the land and sea creatures who need a better place to live. Allowing one small group to elevate themselves to such a prominent position defeats the purpose of the democracy. Do your thing but not when it infringes on the other members of the country. We have learned that in several ways (religion, smoking, education, drunk driving, cell phone driving, even speeding) but can't get clear on this issue. Do the right thing...do not allow driving on Hatteras or any other national seashore

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3150    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,04,2010 13:01:48  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** The people who use the park & the beaches and are not on off road vehicles deserve the opportunity to peacefully enjoy it. Please weigh their interests (& they are the majority) when making your decision. Thank you, Michael Wechter

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3151    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,04,2010 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. We ask that any plan that is approved will do the following:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families 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. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.?

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3152    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Stankiewicz, Dianne  
**Received:** May,04,2010 13:09:26  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As a native of North Carolina I have been a life long visitor and supporter of our beautiful Outer Banks. Hatteras and Ocracoke Island in particular have always been my family's favorite vacation destinations. It is extremely frustrating and heartbreaking to know that these places we love and enjoy so much could be restricted to a point that people and future generations will no longer be able to experience and appreciate these locations to their fullest extent. National Parks by definition belong to the PEOPLE don't they? In 20 years of visiting Ocracoke Island I have never seen anyone abuse or disrupt the beaches or wildlife in any way. The locals, fishermen and vacationers are appreciative and respectful of the island and it's wildlife. We are all drawn to Ocracoke in awe of its natural beauty and grateful for the opportunity to fish from it's shoreline. I personally have family and friends that live on Ocracoke Island. They are all hard-working people, most of which hold several jobs to earn enough income to survive. These people and their small businesses pay taxes that support the government, state and county in which they live just like the rest of us. Their livelihood however, depends heavily on tourism and especially on the fishermen who need access to the shoreline. Closing the beaches to ORV severely impacts the local economy because those fishermen and visitors on whom the locals depend will choose to vacation elsewhere. Beach closure restrictions not only hurt individual families and local businesses,lost revenue hurts everyone! I strongly agree with the Dare County Position. The included affidavits from impacted local business owners are very real and concerning. These people have the right to expect their businesses to remain open and to grow. Through no fault of their own they are failing. The losses they experienced during beach closures are painfully measurable. I am a wildlife enthusiast and have contributed to environmental causes. But I cannot support a proposal that may or may not help a bird species at the expense of human beings whose families and ancestors have inhabited the same island with full and open access to the shoreline for 100+ years.

Finally, there is no guarantee that the proposed closures and restrictions will resolve the plight of the wildlife concerned. The only guarantee is the severe economic hardship these closures will cause the local residents, their families and small businesses in the surrounding areas.

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3153	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,04,2010 13:18:30						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>"I am a resident of North Carolina who enjoys recreational opportunities offered by the Cape Hatteras National Seashore and Recreational Area. Reasonable and safe pedestrian and vehicular access to the beach is essential to participate and enjoy these resources and opportunities. I also support restrictions and conditions necessary to protect the birds, sea turtles, and other biota that are supported by scientific data and can make the Seashore home for part of the year. I believe the favor alternative (#7) advanced by the NPS is more restrictive than necessary to meet protection of the Seashore. I have read and agree with the proposal to manage ORV's on the Seashore prepared and submitted for consideration by the Coalition for Beach Access. My position is that the NPS accept this alternative or at least postpone a final decision on the ORV Plan pending further review and negotiation on the counter points raised by the Coalition for Beach Access."</p> <p>Sincerely, Sam Glenn</p>						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3154	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,04,2010 13:20:02						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>Please protect our public and natural beaches from excessive beach driving. In particular please stop all traffic during critical egg laying times for both shore birds and sea turtles. We need to protect our natural areas. There are roads that can be used. Please be sure that any plan you develop will protect the natural beauty of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Thank you, Debbie Hahn</p>						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3155	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,04,2010 13:20:30						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>I am a resident of North Carolina who enjoys recreational opportunities offered by the Cape Hatteras National Seashore and Recreational Area. Reasonable and safe pedestrian and vehicular access to the beach is essential to participate and enjoy these resources and opportunities. I also support restrictions and conditions necessary to protect the birds, sea turtles, and other biota that are supported by scientific data and can make the Seashore home for part of the year. I believe the favor alternative (#7) advanced by the NPS is more restrictive than necessary to meet protection of the Seashore. I have read and agree with the proposal to manage ORV's on the Seashore prepared and submitted for consideration by the Coalition for Beach Access. My position is that the NPS accept this alternative or at least postpone a final decision on the ORV Plan pending further review and negotiation on the counter points raised by the Coalition for Beach Access."</p> <p>Sincerely, William F Gatter</p>						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3156	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,04,2010 13:21:14						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>The Cape Hatteras National Seashore is a valuable and beautiful national park. It belongs to all citizens, not just a vocal minority (off-road vehicle enthusiasts).</p> <p>The recent environmental disaster in the Gulf of Mexico which continues unabated should be a lesson to us to treat natural resources and undeveloped lands with respect; they should be protected as important components of the ecosystem. The fragile Outer Banks should not be jeopardized or destroyed by people who want to drive on the dunes, spewing exhaust and carbon emissions from fossil fuels into the atmosphere, while destroying the delicate dune grasses.</p> <p>Please protect the beauty of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore for all people and for its diverse native species. Please preserve for its more than two million annual visitors equal access to a safe, quiet, clean, pristine national park beach.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3157	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,04,2010 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> <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> </ul> <p>If the park service does not protect our nation's wildlife, who will do that job. Certainly not that subset of Americans who believe that nature was established to give them a playground for driving and fishing. Those activities have a place in our national parks and seashores, but wildlife must be protected first.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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>						

0009672

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.  
Phillip Manning 315 East Rosemary Street Chapel Hill, NC 27514

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3158    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,04,2010 13:24:13  
**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.  
People seem not to be able to understand what a park is for; it is to preserve nature, not destroy it. ORV's belong in amusement parks along with roller coasters, snow mobiles, etc., not nature parks. Nature must come first. The park is there for people who appreciate NATURE, not for the immature who want stomach thrills.  
Marietta Smith

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3159    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Blevins, Owen T  
**Received:** May,04,2010 13:26:33  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I endorse adoption of Alternative "F" for the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Off-Road Vehicle Management Plan / Environmental Impact Statement. The no action alternatives are unacceptable. I believe Alternative F will provide the best access for fishermen and others as well provide the highest level of protection for wildlife and the intra dunal beach system

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3160    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Sheffield, John G  
**Received:** May,04,2010 13:34:46  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I would like to speak in favor of preserving ORV access in Cape Hatteras National Seashore. When this park was established, part of the Mission was to accommodate recreational activity. I have been visiting this park since the late 1960s for surfing, bird watching, shelling, and surf fishing. In my opinion, the NPS has done an excellent job in balancing the interests of many diverse user groups over most of those years. However, in recent years legal actions have forced the NPS to restrict ORV access beyond reasonable measures. I believe the ORV access areas prior to the Consent Decree were reasonable in protecting sensitive shoreline habitat. These areas also provided reasonable access to fishermen and other users. I encourage you to restore ORV access to the levels prior to the legal actions taken by groups that may not in fact be users at all.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3161    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,04,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** "I am a resident of North Carolina who enjoys recreational opportunities offered by the Cape Hatteras National Seashore and Recreational Area. Reasonable and safe pedestrian and vehicular access to the beach is essential to participate and enjoy these resources and opportunities. I also support restrictions and conditions necessary to protect the birds, sea turtles, and other biota that are supported by scientific data and can make the Seashore home for part of the year. I believe the favor alternative (#7) advanced by the NPS is more restrictive than necessary to meet protection of the Seashore. I have read and agree with the proposal to manage ORV's on the Seashore prepared and submitted for consideration by the Coalition for Beach Access. My position is that the NPS accept this alternative or at least postpone a final decision on the ORV Plan pending further review and negotiation on the counter points raised by the Coalition for Beach Access."  
Our family has enjoyed visiting and driving to our favorite fishing spots on the Outer Banks for many, many years. Since the first closings, we have only returned two times. There is so little room to fish and enjoy these beautiful beaches. We have always cleaned the area, left no evidence that we were even there, and even cleaned up things that were washed ashore. I certainly can see that the closures are hurting the economy of the region. If you are a sport fisherman, why go if you can't fish where you need to be to actually CATCH fish!  
Please consider the residents and taxpayers of NC as you make these decisions.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3162    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Long, James S  
**Received:** May,04,2010 13:41:44  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am a resident of North Carolina who enjoys the opportunity to make many fishing visits to the Cape Hatteras beaches from my home in Wilmington, NC. Reasonable and safe pedestrian and vehicular access to the beach is essential to participate and enjoy these wonderful beaches. While I support restrictions and conditions necessary to protect the birds, sea turtles, and other life that are supported by scientific data and can make the Seashore home for part of the year, I believe alternative 7 advanced by the NPS is more restrictive than necessary to meet protection of the Seashore. I have read and agree with the proposal to manage ORV's on the Seashore prepared and submitted for consideration by the 'Coalition for Beach Access'. My position is that the NPS accept this alternative or at least postpone a final decision on the ORV Plan pending further review and negotiation on the counter points raised by the 'Coalition for Beach Access'. No organization is better informed and more knowledgeable about the ecosystem on the OBX than the 'Coalition for Beach Access'. To disregard its comprehensive 77 page report is a slap in the face of the the local community on the Outer Banks and every North Carolinian that makes up this 'Coalition'. Please do the right thing and delay any decision until this report is carefully reviewed. It makes no sense to close an area of beach for 1000 yards because of a bird's nest or to permanently close two of the most productive fishing inlets on the east coast - Oregon Inlet and Hatteras Inlet. Where is the so-called "science " in this decision. It certainly is not supported in the 820-page DEIS report. I fear that if you adopt the restrictive alternative 7, you will ultimately destroy the livelihoods of the people that live on the OBX and depend on fishermen like me to help support their businesses. Please do the right thing and join hands with the Coalition in helping to protect and preserve our Outer Banks so man and nature can live in harmony with rules that make sense. Thank you for your consideration. James Long 207 Summer Rest Rd Wilmington, NC 28405 jimlong207@bellsouth.net

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3163    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Clegg, Ann A  
**Received:** May,04,2010 13:43:07  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** My parents lived in Manteo for four years during the early 1950s, but I had left home by that time and was working. Every chance I got, I would go home. Even though I never lived there, I grew to love the area. There are great stories about the area. My Dad and I used to fish off old sunken LSTs and had great fun. We went to Duck once. At that time there were a few fishermen and their families living there. I remember we could not turn around

0009673

and had to back the car to get back on Hwy.158. There was only way to get to Manteo by the highway except during the day, and since I worked during the week, I would start on Friday after 5pm and get there around midnight. There were no other bridges.

Many years later, after the bridges were built, I returned there with my husband and children. Many more houses had been built on the ocean front. Vehicles were driven on the ocean front. Jockey Ridge seemed to have decreased. We used to love climbing Jockey Ridge and roll down. My children never got that opportunity. We climbed Jockey Ridge, but no one rolled down. That fun is gone. The community in the woods behind the Wright Memorial is gone - both the woods and the community, Oh, yes, there is a boulevard named for that little community.

Does money have to destroy all our wonderful areas? Is there any way to keep places like the Outer Banks with its rich history and wonderful fun for future generations? Can we even keep the Outer Banks. Already we are losing sand to the ocean. Earlier sea oats were sown to protect the area. What are we going to do about that? Does anyone care that can stop this madness?

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3164    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Sabiston, Michael

**Received:** May,04,2010 13:46:38

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Sirs:

Please note my agreement with the Dare County Commissioners position report on this topic.

I have been a recreational fisherman for many years, and I believe the recreational fisherman community is supportive of the methods proposed by the commissioners. I am always aware of bird and turtle nest warning signs and corridors. I am a person who believes in the preservation of wildlife and nature, and would do nothing to interfere with protected species. It seems to me that the recreational fisherman is the greatest asset to the preservation of the naturalness and beauty of the Outer Banks.

Please take these comments and others into consideration in making your decision.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Michael A. Sabiston

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3165    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,04,2010 13:48:18

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** please preserve the freedom and rights for my children and grandchildren to camp on the beach and enjoy God's creation.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3166    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,04,2010 13:54:03

**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:** 3167    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,04,2010 13:54:04

**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.

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3168	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	
<b>Name:</b>	Hawkins, Paul					
<b>Received:</b>	May,04,2010 00:00:00					
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>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. We all deserve equal access and a safe space on a national park beach. Please preserve Cape Hatteras National Seashore and all national parks.</p> <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. We ask that any plan that is approved will do the following:</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>Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best 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>					
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3169	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	
<b>Name:</b>	Hardy, Daniel F					
<b>Received:</b>	May,04,2010 14:02:56					
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>With regard to the March 2010 Draft ORV Management Plan EIS, I do not agree with this document and feel that it is totally inadequate in dealing with the social and economic impact this plan will have on the Outer Banks community. As a business owner involved in the vacation rental industry, we have already seen the negative impact of unwarranted beach closures. I also feel that the plan fails terribly in identifying any negative impacts from ORV in the Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Much more study is needed and will only be adequate if performed by impartial scientific researchers. I fully support open and free access to our beaches and completely agree with Dare County DEIS Position Statement.</p> <p>Thank you for your time.</p> <p>Sincerely, Dan Hardy, President Joe Lamb Jr. &amp; Associates</p>					
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3170	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	
<b>Name:</b>	Peterson, Linda L					
<b>Received:</b>	May,04,2010 14:06:08					
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>In light of the economic impact now taking place with the park system, the current events with BP and the Gulf Coast and our profound need for nature at its purest level PLEASE protect Hatteras and ALL of the Parks within our park system. Thank you.</p>					
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3171	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	
<b>Name:</b>	Turk, Kim L					
<b>Received:</b>	May,04,2010 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. We ask that any plan that is approved will do the following:</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>Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best 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>					
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3172	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b> Y
<b>Name:</b>	private					
<b>Received:</b>	May,04,2010 14:09:17					
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I don't think there should be any cars on the beach!					
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3173	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	
<b>Name:</b>	N/A, N/A					
<b>Received:</b>	May,04,2010 14:10:20					

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** NPS MISLEADING PUBLIC ABOUT DEIS NPS SE Regional Director David Vela denied a congressional request to extend the time limit for comments. He denied that request stating that Alternatives A-D were all put forth at Negotiated Rule Making Committee meetings and Alternate F was an attempt to include parts of A-D. While he does acknowledge that said committee didnt reach consensus he implies that these alternatives were the only ones on the table. Unfortunately those of us familiar with the process the committee utilized know that many issues that do not appear in any DEIS Alternative (A-F) were also part of the deliberations and have been left out. The "left out" alternatives are appearing in comments and have been reviewed by Dare Co, Hyde Co, and the Coalition for Beach Access. Unfortunately for those not familiar with the process, Mr Vela's remarks imply that Alternates A-F are the only game in town. Untrue, misleading, and stacking the deck against any changes in moving from Draft to Final EIS. If that's NPS' game its illegal!

**Correspondence ID:** 3174 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Brady, Richard**Received:** May,04,2010 14:10:40**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am a property owner in Buxton, North Carolina and a legal resident of Virginia. I am also a member of the Cape Hatteras Anglers Club in Buxton, North Carolina. I enjoy recreational opportunities offered by the Cape Hatteras National Seashore and Recreational Area and have been coming there for vacations multiple times per year for 30 years. Reasonable and safe pedestrian and vehicular access to the beach is an essential part of what my family enjoys as we partake in the wonderful public resource this area provides. I support restrictions and conditions necessary to protect the birds, sea turtles, and other biota that make the Seashore home for part of the year, provided that the restrictions are supported by scientific data. I believe the NPS favored alternative (F) is much more restrictive than necessary to protect the Seashore. I have read and agree with the proposal to manage ORV's on the Seashore prepared and submitted for consideration by the Coalition for Beach Access; the Coalition for Beach Access - Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area ORV Access Environmental Impact Position Statement. My position is that the NPS accept this alternative or at least postpone a final decision on the ORV Plan pending further review and negotiation on the counter points raised by the Coalition for Beach Access. Thanks for your consideration  
Rich Brady

**Correspondence ID:** 3175 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

**Name:** private**Received:** May,04,2010 00:00:00**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am a full-time resident of North Carolina's Outer Banks, and I support significant improvements over the current situation in pedestrian access and environmental protection for the Seashore.  
I currently do not feel welcome to utilize this significant natural resource, although access for citizens is a stated goal. There are very few places on the Seashore beaches where I do not have to worry that my family will be struck by a fast-moving vehicle.  
And there is a clear legislated mandate that the Seashore should provide protected wildlife habitat. These protections need to be extended. With so much vehicular traffic on the beaches, there are few areas for wildlife to be undisturbed.  
It would be wonderful to have areas where we could walk through the Seashore and take in the wildlife in the distance. If this were the case, new visitors would replace beach-drivers that would be displaced. Yes, keep some areas for the beach-drivers who have become accustomed to this form of entertainment. But please restore much of this essential resource to its stated goals.

**Correspondence ID:** 3176 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

**Name:** private**Received:** May,04,2010 00:00:00**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** "I am a resident of North Carolina who enjoys recreational opportunities offered by the Cape Hatteras National Seashore and Recreational Area. Reasonable and safe pedestrian and vehicular access to the beach is essential to participate and enjoy these resources and opportunities. I also support restrictions and conditions necessary to protect the birds, sea turtles, and other biota that are supported by scientific data and can make the Seashore home for part of the year. I believe the favor alternative (#7) advanced by the NPS is more restrictive than necessary to meet protection of the Seashore. I have read and agree with the proposal to manage ORV's on the Seashore prepared and submitted for consideration by the Coalition for Beach Access. My position is that the NPS accept this alternative or at least postpone a final decision on the ORV Plan pending further review and negotiation on the counter points raised by the Coalition for Beach Access."

**Correspondence ID:** 3177 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

**Name:** N/A, N/A**Received:** May,04,2010 14:13:55**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** The Park Service's mission is to preserve and protect the park for future generations. Please do this. While recreational vehicular and pedestrian access is important, it is very important to have sensitive habitat areas off limits to human use of any kind to preserve and protect the processes and species known and unknown. As a local resident, I want some access to the park, but i feel Dare County's efforts and the efforts of some recreational groups to paint a scenario of economic doom have gone too far. Please have some areas open for human use, some closed and some open seasonally if impacts are minimal. Reasonable dialog and compromise are essential and I hope that we have a meeting of the minds soon and can stop talking about this issue so that everyone can focus on their jobs--renting homes or managing the park.

**Correspondence ID:** 3178 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

**Name:** N/A, N/A**Received:** May,04,2010 14:17:38**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** CLOSING THE BEACHES AS PROPOSED WILL DEVESTATE THE OUTER BANKS ECONOMY. THE WILDLIFE & HUMANS HAVE BEEN VERY HAPPY TOGETHER UP TO NOW  
A P THORPE

**Correspondence ID:** 3179 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

**Name:** riggs, richard m**Received:** May,04,2010 14:18:05**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Before any actions are taken that impact the citizens of these united states, their consent should be obtained. It is ridiculous that animal groups, on behalf of animals, are able to impact on any level the lives of the citizens of the towns on the outer banks. until and unless doctor doolittle shows up and convinces the citizenry that humans can communicate with animals, any government action will be seen as singularly to the benefit of the government, or special interest groups that control politicians, at the expense of the taxpaying citizen.

and since i strayed onto the subject of taxpayer cost, what exactly has been the cost to the taxpayer for the "protection" of a few birds? how many new trucks, new salaried NPS agents, and additional office staff has been created since the lawyers became involved?  
 the fisherman asks for no federal money...he only asks to be left alone. the surfer asks for no money...he only asks to be left alone. the sailboarder asks for no money...he only asks to be left alone. the citizen shell hunter asks for no money...he only asks to be left alone. all who recreate on the obx, save the birdwatcher, ask for nothing.  
 the birdwatcher demands an entire island bow to his animal rights doctrine. the birdwatcher demands an entire island cease and desist all activities that are perceived as threatening to the birds.  
 as long as the taxpayer is paying (and he is) he will not accept any ruling that "respects" the will of the very very few at the expense of the many.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3180    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,04,2010 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 strongly urge you to place the needs of our nation's natural resources first in your plans for the Cape Hatteras National Seashore. It currently appears that the preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species that are free of ORV use year-round. Protection of breeding birds and sea turtles must be a priority in our national parks and such protection should be based on the best available scientific information.  
 I urge you and your staff to establish and meet clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. AWhere there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not showing recovery, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
 Mahalo (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.  
 Sincerely, Norma Bustos 1312 Mokapu Blvd. Kailua, HI 96734

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3181    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,04,2010 14:24:36  
**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. It's time we all learn to live in harmony with the planet, including All of it's inhabitants.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3182    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,04,2010 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 be true to the original principles of National Park, ie providing shelter and support for our rapidly diminishing natural co-habitants of the earth. I do not go to the seashore to smell gas fumes and listen to loud speakers and trip over tire ruts and worry about getting run over. I go because I want to rest and renourish myself with earth's masterpieces: the ocean, the sky, the sound of waves breaking and birds calling. Driving on any beach is a violation of that serenity, not to mention of habitat.  
 Should the park not choose to enact Alternative D, I submit that the following considerations be an essential part of the plan:  
 If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families 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. Set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV 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 to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
 Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until 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 closely following the progress of your efforts 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>	3183	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596
<b>Name:</b>	Brawner, Helen R				
<b>Received:</b>	May,04,2010 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>Thanks for giving me the chance to comment on the National Park Service's proposed ORV use management plan for Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the one identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified for providing increased pedestrian access.</p> <p>Please assure that any plan accepted &amp; implemented will:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Provision of Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This would not provide a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If 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, along with increased walkways &amp; improved access, would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and family safety while enjoying the Seashore would be enhanced and wildlife's potential rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park be undeterred.</li> <li>2) Protection of natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first! Recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas free of ORV use for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species year round. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers should be maximized beyond the preferred plan &amp; increased to protect breeding birds and sea turtles, especially in light of decreased numbers nationally due to the recent Gulf oil disaster.</li> <li>3) Establishment &amp; Monitoring Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. The plan must include clear goals and progress markers for wildlife recovery. While there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the Seashore's potential to support wildlife rather than on recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should include all migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.?</li> </ol>				
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3184	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596
<b>Name:</b>	Blevins, Sharon S				
<b>Received:</b>	May,04,2010 14:26:05				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I endorse adoption of Alternative "F" for the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Off-Road Vehicle Management Plan / Environmental Impact Statement. The no action alternatives are unacceptable. I believe Alternative F will provide the best access for fishermen and others as well provide the highest level of protection for wildlife and the intra dunal beach system.				
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3185	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596
<b>Name:</b>	private				
<b>Received:</b>	May,04,2010 14:30:24				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I would like to see Cape Hatteras National Seashore have protections from off road vehicles. The beach is a place for recreation that has less impact on the environment, wildlife, and natural relaxation. Vehicles pollute, can damage nests and habitats, and waste precious resources like oil. Off road vehicles on National beaches should be a thing of the past considering the scientific knowledge that we currently have on global warming and the effects of damaged habitat. When I go to the beach, I am not interested in avoiding vehicles or smelling fumes. Please keep it a natural experience for everyone involved.				
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3186	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596
<b>Name:</b>	Bernhardt, Michael W				
<b>Received:</b>	May,04,2010 14:30:41				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>I am a 64 year old resident of North Carolina who has been coming to Cape Hatteras fishing and vacationing as long as I can remember. My father was one of the early surf fishing pioneers who discovered the joys of beach driving and surf fishing back in the late 30's and early 40's. I have been a property owner in Avon since 1979 and currently own two vacation rentals in Avon valued at in excess of 1 million dollars. I depend upon the rental income from this investment to fund my retirement.</p> <p>While I am a life long Boy Scout and an avid protector of the environment I strongly feel that an injustice has been done in closing the beaches of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore and trying to make it into a wildlife refuge. The purpose of a national seashore is for the enjoyment of the public and the public cannot enjoy the beach if they are not granted access. It is hard for me to believe that any endangered birds would not find their way approximately 20 miles up the highway to the Pea Island Wildlife Refuge. Nature has been adapting on Hatteras Island for thousands of years and to me this situation is no exception.</p> <p>Please return the National Seashore back to one which can be enjoyed by all who come seeking the recreational opportunities which I enjoyed and remember so fondly as a young man. Return the beaches back to the people.</p> <p>Yours truly, Mike Bernhardt</p>				
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3187	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596
<b>Name:</b>	Smith, Audrey W				
<b>Received:</b>	May,04,2010 14:33:22				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>The beauty and creation that God has bestowed upon us is so very fragile and precious to all. The beaches are part of God's natural plan and we are simply put "Conservators" to this most precious gift. We look upon things of value such as gold and silver but few of us really see some of most valuable treasured gifts of all and these gifts are our natural resources. Just recently as this week (May 1,2010) a terrible tragedy occurred in the Gulf of Mexico which will be felt for many, many years as we struggle to clean up that unexpected horror and the tragedy of loss of life both human and to the life of the Gulf of Mexico including industry such as Shrimpping, sea life, birds that require a healthy eco system.</p> <p>There are very few things in life that most people can enjoy and one is our parks our mountains and our beaches in North Carolina. I am fairly new to North Carolina I am originally from Maryland and as a child enjoyed the Chesapeake Bay and the ocean and beaches available to us. Free and open beaches for all to enjoy even if we are not included as one of the elite, the wealthy.</p> <p>Teach and observe all that has been given to us by our Lord and Savior for us to enjoy and preserve for future generations to come. Why is it that the wealthy and all so powerful try to exclude and make the beauty of this earth open and available only to those with economic means. When God meant for the earth to be loved and enjoyed even by the less fortunate of us. It is our Privilege to share the sands of time with all because like a grain of sand so is the time of our lives very small and short.</p> <p>I do agree that we need to become more atuned with the term "Green" and expect to be held responsible if we choose to damage our gift. To be more considerate of those around us and to share the knowledge of how to tender care on behave of our eco-system.</p> <p>With the Peace of Christ Audrey Workman Smith</p>				

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3188    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Wilson, A  
**Received:** May,04,2010 14:36:45  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** The primary goal in protecting Cape Hatteras National Seashore is to protect the ecosystems and wildlife that are home to this region. With respect for this priority, I support the "Alternative D" plan with an added emphasis on greater pedestrian access and clearly defined and monitored wildlife recovery goals.  
Thank you!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3189    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Jakob, Frank A  
**Received:** May,04,2010 14:36:53  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am a full time resident of Hatteras Island and have been surf fishing on the beach of Cape Hatteras National Seashore for over 40 years. I live less than 1/4 mile from ramp 23 in Salvo and have driven the beach daily with my 4x4 truck for over 30 years. I feel that my comments are from first hand experience and not from a text book or theories.  
I want to go on record that I was part of the groups that help draft the first off road ordinances on Cape Cod (Massachusetts), Assentague island (Maryland & Virginia), Island Beach State Park (NJ), Brigantine (NJ) and Cape Hatteras (NC) back in the late 1960's and early 1970's. Yes! We had a set of regulations for Cape Hatteras National Seashore that somehow never got published in the Federal Register for some unknown reason. Nothing has really changed about beach driving and public use and the birds, turtles and bees other then it got more bureaucratic.I do not have the time to read over 500 pages of suggestions nor do I have the ability to comprehend what is being said. I did this last year with the first draft and really didn't know what was being said. Anybody can draft a set of rules and regulations that are so confusing that the public doeLooks So with that in mind, I suggest the following.  
1. Permits: required so people will have some sort of understanding of the rules and regulations. Make them available on line and require people to read the regulations and watch a video about how to drive on the beach...first order of priority is to let the air down to 15-20 pounds and most will not get stuck.Require people to sign accept and allow them to use credit cards.Make this an annual charge and cost enough to discourage the unwanted drivers and hot roders. Start with \$100 annual or \$25 weekly fee. Issue a decal to be placed on the front and rear driver side bumpers...same as what Assentague is using. We don't have to reinvent the wheel.This is a user fee and any serious fisherman or bird watcher will pay without any questions.  
2. Handicap access and Golden Eagle Pass accessible. Use the permit money to manage the park and make every ramp handicap accessible.If this were a private enterprise or city beach of Saint Augustine in Florida it would make enough money to manage itself and have money for R&M.Saint Augustine charges \$7 per day per vehicle. There is a booth at every ramp.  
3. Birds: Close the beach when nesting but allow a cooridor along the ocean.  
4. turtles: transplant the nest to a safe haven and allow them to hatch and return to the water without any problems. We only have 1% of turtle nest in NC as opposed to Florida which has over 80% of all turtle nest.  
5. Night Driving....allow this because it is the best time to be on the beach.  
Make all this info available on line and post information at every ramp. People are used to pay user fees, so with the permit money you will be able to manage the seashore much better than what you can do now. It's impossible to anticipate every change in direction. Let the Park service manage it on a daily basis.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3190    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Hodik, Barbara  
**Received:** May,04,2010 14:39:15  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Aside from this website being user unfriendly, I feel that during this period in our nation's history when we are all experiencing the fall-out of ill-considered policies which led to the destruction of so much of our national parks' ecology in the name of satisfying a small group of individuals whose entertainment consists of driving on fragile beaches as if they were a NASCAR track. We've seen what that does, we should not be encouraging that kind of recreational behavior.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3191    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Buckner, Carolyn M  
**Received:** May,04,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
It is important to me that any plan that is approved will do the following:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families 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. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3192    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Berry, Mary L  
**Received:** May,04,2010 14:42:37  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Keep vehicles off the beach at Hatteras! Give sea turtles and nesting shorebirds space! Give them safe haven. Keep pollution from these vehicles off the beach. Let others enjoy the environs without the parade of trucks & cars. It's a practice that should be stopped before the next generation copies the actions of their parents and grandparents. Walk to the beach. Stroll on the beach. Be considerate of others. More trash and litter accumulates when there are cars & trucks. Let the rangers who patrol the beach go in their ATV's or trucks. They have to manage and make sure rules are observed. They have

to cover ground. But fishermen - if I can walk with my fishing pole - so can you! Thank you, Lucy Berry, Ruffin, NC

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3193	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,04,2010 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>Of the 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 hope that any plan that is approved will do the following:</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>* Protect Natural Resources and Wildlife of the Seashore. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best 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>						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3194	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,04,2010 14:46:42						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I favor complete elimination of motor vehicles from beaches. If we cannot get complete elimination, I favor very substantial reduction of motor vehicle traffic, especially from areas intended for natural preservation and recreation.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3195	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,04,2010 14:47:31						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>I disagree with the current restriction as outline in this draft. It seems that we have existed here on Hatteras Island in some cases for generations all along co-habitating with other creatures on the island and even cleaning up storm debris to in sure the animals don't loose life.</p> <p>Why not look at the simplicity of this way of life instead of layer the people with draconian layers of bureaucracy. Do you actually believe that the folks visiting our island will take time to review this 800 page document before they come. Or is this the underlining ideas of the NPS to penalize those who other wise would be breaking know rule. It only took a few pages to run this country for the past 200 years yet we need this pile of paper to protect a species that is not endangered.</p> <p>The reality is with this you will only be pressing a large population of people into a smaller area which compounds the environmental impact.</p>						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3196	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,04,2010 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. We ask that any plan that is approved will do the following:</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>Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best 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>						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3197	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	
<b>Name:</b>	Deal, Jeffrey G						
<b>Received:</b>	May,04,2010 14:47:59						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>Please release the Grand Canyon 1987 National Parks Overflights Act Plan today - THANKS!</p> <p>:)</p> <p>Jeff Deal</p>						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3198	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	
<b>Name:</b>	Babics, William S						
<b>Received:</b>	May,04,2010 14:48:46						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>P121 ff I disagree as to as to the projected area of protection. A piping plover should have a 100 meter area of protection. If a plover is nested by a beach house you cant' expect the homeowner to abandon the offending building. 100 meters should be similarly allowed for oystercatchers</p>						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3199	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,04,2010 14:50:31  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am proud to be a carrier of a NC Lifetime Hunting and Fishing License. I have hunted and fished all my life and this ORV restriction makes me completely sick. I have gone to the OBX since I was a child and enjoyed the fact that we had the freedom to use our State's beautiful resources as we do. The fact that some liberal tree hugger can come in and try and take that right away sickens me. Why can't we work on a solution rather than penalize the people that respect and protect these areas the most. I have read numerous articles about said Piping Plover and it seems that most damage to the species has come from the NPS itself. I would just hope and pray that for once someone other than a lobbyist or self serving politician will look at the whole picture and not the one lining their pockets. Think about the small towns that depend on the revenue that is generated in the fall and winter from the fisherman that come from numerous states to enjoy our state. Please for once Raleigh/Washington use some COMMON SENSE!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3200    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,04,2010 14:54:12  
**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:** 3201    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,04,2010 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 believe that the nesting birds, turtles and other wildlife have a right to hold onto their habitat, even if it curtails people's use of the beaches of North Carolina. Human development has transformed much of our beaches into a vacationland for people, leaving the shoreline in the National Seashore as an important sliver of habitat for the Piping Plover and the endangered turtles.  
Please, this is the balance we need. Support Alternative D, or another option that provides pedestrian access and wildlife access to the important breeding habitats in the breeding season.  
Thanks,  
Craig Lawrence

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3202    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,04,2010 14:54:54  
**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:** 3203    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

0009681

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,04,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** "I am a resident of North Carolina who enjoys recreational opportunities offered by the Cape Hatteras National Seashore and Recreational Area. Reasonable and safe pedestrian and vehicular access to the beach is essential to participate and enjoy these resources and opportunities. I also support restrictions and conditions necessary to protect the birds, sea turtles, and other biota that are supported by scientific data and can make the Seashore home for part of the year. I believe the favor alternative (#7) advanced by the NPS is more restrictive than necessary to meet protection of the Seashore. I have read and agree with the proposal to manage ORV's on the Seashore prepared and submitted for consideration by the Coalition for Beach Access. My position is that the NPS accept this alternative or at least postpone a final decision on the ORV Plan pending further review and negotiation on the counter points raised by the Coalition for Beach Access."  
While I may have taken the easy way by simply copying the CCA statement, I do believe the Coalition for Beach Access position is the most beneficial for all concerned including wildlife.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3204    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Curtright, Ryan M  
**Received:** May,04,2010 14:59:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am a kiteboarder from Seattle who has visited Hatteras several times. It is a wonderful place to visit, vacation, relax with a walk along the beach, and most importantly to me and many other Cape Hatteras is one of the best locations to kiteboard in the world. It is acclaimed world wide as one of the best locations. It has gained the reputation of being the "gorge" of the East Coast. Many people from all over the world fly in to kite in Hatteras. Also, many people's livelihood is through the kiting economy on Hatteras, including kite manufacturers, kite school, and kite instructors.  
Please do not restrict access to one of the best locations to kite in the USA. Instead, be proud and uphold kitesurfing/kiteboarding in Hatteras. It is a natural sport that is "green" and has very little impact on the environment. No gas....just wind and water.  
After reading the access plan, I noticed that it addresses more, much more, than those just wanting to drive on the beach. In my opinion, the environmental groups wish to critically influence the National Park Service to shift its dual mandate of providing for the protection of the natural resources and wildlife WHILE simultaneously providing for the public's right to current and future recreational opportunities (access) to a policy of denying human entry into large areas of the park and severely restricting the public's access to all portions of the beach.  
There is room for both public use and resource management. However, the science offered to support the environmentalist positions does not justify the extreme ORV and pedestrian access restrictions proposed in the DEIS.  
Please reserve the publics access to this world class kiteboarding location, and I will continue to visit, encourage other kites to visit...bring money and business to the area anually which can only strengthen the local enconomy! Kind regards, \_Ryan Curtright

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3205    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** May,04,2010 15:04:42  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am commenting on the beach closures for the piping plover on Hatteras Island. While endangered species need to protected, so do the socioeconomic and cultural conditions of unique areas such as Hatteras Island. As this situation has unfolded, there has arisen an imbalance in addressing the needs and concerns of all stake holders. To date, more has been done to protect the plovers than the other stake holders. Clearly there are better, more balanced solutions to satisfying the needs of the community, while at the same time, offering relief to the pressure on the breeding pairs of birds.  
Thank you for listening.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3206    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,04,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** After reviewing the NPS DEIS I must disagree with all of the alternatives within the document.  
I have; however, reviewed the 77 page Coalition for Beach Access Position Statement signed by several groups that were a part of the negotiated rule making process and it by far succeeds in furnishing the best visitor experience while maintaining the needs of protecting the fragile resources.  
Please consider all aspects of this alternative and put people back into the management of Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3207    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,04,2010 15:11:54  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am opposed to all off road vehicular driving on the beaches of our national seashores. They cause damage to the beach ecology and wildlife and disturb the experience for those of us who visit these national seashores for their natural beauty. Why should the minority of people who drive on beaches have priority over the majority who walk there? This does not reflect our democratic principles.  
I respectfully request that you ban all beach driving at the Cape Hatteras National Seashore. This will set an excellent precedent for the banning of driving on all of our national seashores.  
Sincerely yours, Thomas T. Struhsaker, Ph.D.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3208    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,04,2010 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 ask that any plan that is approved will do the following:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families 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. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are

0009682

management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.?

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3209    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** May,04,2010 15:16:46  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please do not subject our fragile coastal wildlands to the pollution, noise, and degradation that comes with unlimited beach access for ORVs. Our native and migrating wildlife is already under great stress from climate change, and that stress is growing, as the oil from the Gulf's underwater volcano enters the Gulf Stream to come to pollute our beaches. The ecosystem is already under attack. Wildlife must have a place of refuge, and allowing ORVs to intrude into these refuge areas defeats the purpose of even having them. I, and many others, would prefer to know that wilderness is protected, even if that means we can never visit it in person in an ORV. Don't let the vocal minority of beach abusers sway your decision; act to protect our fragile beaches and wildlife while there is still some left to protect!  
Let North Carolina be the "Coastal Wildlife Refuge State". Perhaps other states would support our setting aside this land from exploitation if it would earn them Green Credits. This could become a significant source of income for NC.  
We must take the long view and not allow the joy-riding desires of a few ORV agitants to destroy our coastal Eden, so that it will be here for our children's future.  
Thank you for allowing me to express my opinion on this most important matter.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3210    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,04,2010 15:23:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I disagree with the NPS failure to consider areas adjacent to or in close proximity to the Recreational Area in formulating bird counts(pg 124). Dredge and spoil islands provide a predator free environment for birds and are easily accessible to them. When considering bird populations in any area, the area within the whole ecosystem should be considered in order to get an accurate count. Accuracy is vital when so much is at stake for so many.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3211    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** simmons, john w  
**Received:** May,04,2010 15:23:40  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I regularly travel to Beaufort up into Pamlico sound where I kitesurf. When I do, I stay in hotels, eat at restaurants etc. In short my vacations bring much needed tax dollars to your state.  
If you close this area to kite surfing, I will travel to Florida to Texas where they are much friendlier to the sport.  
Regards,  
John W. Simmons

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3212    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,04,2010 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 think it is very important to realize that the outer banks are the only breeding habitat for many coastal shore birds and marine turtles and other wildlife. They don't have a choice to move and do their breeding elsewhere. People have free will and choice of where they can recreate and play and most people are smart enough and have sufficient resources to be able to seek alternatives that don't interfere with their neighbors, be they human or wildlife. Lets give the wildlife a chance and show some respect for mother nature and set aside these critical areas of the outerbanks for the wildlife that desperately needs it. We have developed the vast majority of the coastal strip to meet the recreation needs of us selfish people, now we need to think about allowing enough space for the basic biological needs of some of the rest of mother natures children.  
I support any outerbanks management plan that meets the absolute needs of wildlife and at the same time allows regulation of human impacts on these critical areas.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3213    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,04,2010 15:24:15  
**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:** 3214    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,04,2010 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 give access to the beaches but also allow less disturbance of wildlife. This is important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under Alternative F, the National Park Service's preferred plan, Off-Road Vehicles would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3215    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,04,2010 15:24:22  
**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.  
Please do support this plan! This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3216    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,04,2010 15:24:29  
**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.

0009684

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3217    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,04,2010 15:24:52  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Nps,

i had been coming to ocracoke since i was 5 years old. my grandparents moved here to buy a motel. they moved here from york pa. my grandparents vacationed here with their 4 children and like it so much they moved here 1965. i would visit them and enjoy the wonderful beach. i lived in new mexico until 1978, when my parents divorced. we moved to ocracoke in april 1978, i was 11 years old. at that time there werent many places you couldnt drive on the beach. most people, although not all, were respectful of the beach area and we had so many good times at the beach.having grown up here since then, the beach has been an itegral part of my childhood and my growing from adolescents to adult hood. now as a grown person with two children. we enjoy the beach at lease once a week when a bunch of families gather to cook out and enjoy the nice ocean breeze. we paricularly enjoy going down toward the south point where the beach is generall less crowded and safer for the children. sometimes there are ten to twenty children and thier parent on the beach. we pack all we need for the day in our orv's and set out for a full day at the beach. you see the beach is a great economic asset for tourists and it is also a great stress releiver for those of us who live on the outer banks and pay taxes and welcome our friends from places where there is no beach or ocean breeze to cool the body and the soul. i do understand about the endangered and threatened species of living creatures and flora and fauna. i do not have a problem with regulations, i welcome them, but i do not agree with the closing of all beaches to orvs. i do enjoy being able to find a spot where orvs can not access as well as being able to access ares with my orv. so please help the good people of thes UNITED STATES of AMERICA to be to use these wonderful and pristine beach of Cape Hatters National seashore.

Sincerely Yours,  
Gerald (better known as "Tyke) Ely

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3218    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,04,2010 00:00:00  
**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.

Dear Superintendent Murrary,

Thank you for taking comments on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

The National Seashore was founded for its wildness, uniqueness, and wildlife. At the time, 1937, it was remote and a true jewel. It was meant to be enjoyed by everyone without detriment to the natural resources or to other users.

It teamed with with shorebirds and other wildlife. Today's world of more powerful vehicles, more noise, more pollution, more speed, more users, more trash, all threaten the ability of this natural resource to maintain its level of species.

It is our duty to curb our behavior to ensure that all can continue to enjoy this magical place now and in the future. We are learning this lesson elsewhere in the nation.

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

Juanita Roushdy 47 Keene Neck Road Bremen, ME 04551

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3219    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Guzynski, Elizabeth  
**Received:** May,04,2010 15:26:40  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I would like to see restricted ORV driving on all of the beaches. The present request is for a restriction on Cape Hatteras. It has always been a problem for us as a family to get to the beaches and find them overrun with trucks and other ORV's. Dangerous for the little ones and for all of the wildlife. We need to be a little more gentle with nature and this is a good place to start.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3220    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** DUNIVAN, DAVID  
**Received:** May,04,2010 15:27:10  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** After reviewing the NPS DEIS that is before me and everyone on Hatteras Island, I feel that it is a plan that is too restrictive on the Residents and Visitors alike of Hatteras Island. I have, however, reviewed the Coalition for Beach Access Position Statement and I am strongly in favor or supporting that plan. I feel that this plan will provide the Park Service, it's Visitors, and Residents, the best experience while maintaining the needs of protecting the environment, it's resources, and the many species of animals that are of such concern. I know that I am to make direct statements and comments about the proposed DEIS and specific issues, but in sum, I love the Island, I have bought a house their, and I want to retire their. The reason that I purchased property on the Island was for its beauty, the History of it's people and villages,and most importantly, our access to the Seashore by ORV. The DEIS has consistently put birds as being more important than human beings, their families, and an entire economy with excessive buffers, breeding areas, and closures nearly everywhere. Please put the Management of the Park back into the hands of the majority of the people that have so much to lose, including their businesses and livelihoods, not to mention their history. Please support the Position Statement of the Coalition for Beach Access. Thank

You, David Dunivan

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3221	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,04,2010 15:30:00						
<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. 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>	3222	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,04,2010 15:30:59						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please reserve at least some of the National Seashore for the wilderness experience of sitting in the sand enjoying the sun, wildlife, and ocean without another human in sight for miles. ORV's destroy the experience which is otherwise easily accessible by just walking from the road a few hundred yards through the dunes. Several miles of beach should be reserved for "pedestrian only" access for those of us who treasure the wilderness experience.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3223	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,04,2010 15:31:13						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Hello, I am a life long resident of North Carolina and enjoy the recreational opportunities offered by the Cape Hatteras National Seashore and Recreational Area. Reasonable and safe pedestrian and vehicular access to the beach is essential to participate and enjoy these resources and opportunities. I also support restrictions and conditions necessary to protect the birds, sea turtles, and other biota that are supported by scientific data and can make the Seashore home for part of the year. I believe the favor alternative (#7) advanced by the NPS is more restrictive than necessary to meet protection of the Seashore. I have read and agree with the proposal to manage ORV's on the Seashore prepared and submitted for consideration by the Coalition for Beach Access. My position is that the NPS accept this alternative or at least postpone a final decision on the ORV Plan pending further review and negotiation on the counter points raised by the Coalition for Beach Access. Thanks for the opportunity to provide this comment.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3224	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,04,2010 15:34:25						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please support the "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3225	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,04,2010 15:41:18						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I am a resident of Connecticut and am a member of the Cape Hatteras Anglers Club in Buxton, North Carolina. I enjoy recreational opportunities offered by the Cape Hatteras National Seashore and Recreational Area and have been coming there for vacations multiple times per year for 30 years. Reasonable and safe pedestrian and vehicular access to the beach is an essential part of what my family enjoys as we partake in the wonderful public resource this area provides. I support restrictions and conditions necessary to protect the birds, sea turtles, and other biota that make the Seashore home for part of the year, provided that the restrictions are supported by scientific data. I believe the NPS favored alternative (F) is much more restrictive than necessary to protect the Seashore. I have read and agree with the proposal to manage ORV's on the Seashore prepared and submitted for consideration by the Coalition for Beach Access; the Coalition for Beach Access - Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area ORV Access Environmental Impact Position Statement. My position is that the NPS accept this alternative or at least postpone a final decision on the ORV Plan pending further review and negotiation on the counter points raised by the Coalition for Beach Access.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3226	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	Yarnell, Susan L						
<b>Received:</b>	May,04,2010 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	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. We all deserve equal access and a safe space on a national park beach. I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the 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 ask that any plan that is approved will do the following: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families 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. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.?						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3227	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,04,2010 15:43:42  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Reference: Draft ORV Management Plan/EIS, Part 1 of 2; Chapter 2: Alternatives: Reasonable and safe pedestrian and vehicular access to the beach is essential to participate and enjoy the resources and opportunities offered at the park. In saying this, I also support restrictions and conditions necessary to protect the birds, sea turtles, and other biota that are supported by scientific data and can make the Seashore home for part of the year. I believe the favored alternative advanced by the NPS is more restrictive than necessary to meet protection of the Seashore. I have read and agree with the proposal to manage ORV's on the Seashore prepared and submitted for consideration by the Coalition for Beach Access. My position is that the NPS accept this Coalition for Beach Access alternative or at least postpone a final decision on the ORV Plan pending further review and negotiation on the counter points raised by the Coalition for Beach Access."

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3228    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,04,2010 15:45:51  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Friends -- You have heard both sides of this matter, and I strongly support curbing the infestation with ORV's of this fragile and priceless natural resource. They say that "the wheel that squeaks loudest gets the grease," but I feel that this calls for common decency rather than knuckling under to a loud minority. Thank you for considering my view on this important decision. R. T. Lucas, Jr., M. D.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3229    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,04,2010 15:46:04  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I agree with the Interim Management Plan that was in effect prior to the Consent Decree. I have seen no evidence, scientific or otherwise, that would indicate the need for additional restrictions on pedestrians or ORV's. The Interim Plan was working and had worked for years! My personal observation, pre-Consent Decree, is that the seashore was well cared for. Visitors observed and respected turtle enclosures which were small enough to allow access on foot or in an ORV without negatively impacting visitors and large enough to ensure the safety of the turtles. Bird enclosures were reasonable, allowing for human beach access, and respected. I don't believe that adding restrictions at this time will have a positive impact on the wildlife. It will, however, have a negative impact on people. The Interim Plan is the least restrictive alternative and should be reinstated.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3230    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,04,2010 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. We ask that any plan that is approved will do the following:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families 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. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.?

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3231    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,04,2010 15:54:16  
**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:** 3232    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.04,2010 15:54:16  
**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:** 3233    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.04,2010 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.  
There are those who nurture the wildlife along the outerbanks, and those who would rather exploit it without regard for propagation. It is more sustainable to protect the opportunity for propagation than to ignore it. In spite of those who simply intend to exploit the natural resources and the money they spend, I hope that you are wise enough to support conservation measures .  
sincerely,  
julien mccarthy 1614 hillhaven rd brown summit, NC 27214

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3234    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.04,2010 15:56:16  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Document: Draft ORV Management Plan/EIS; Part 2 of 2; Chapter 4; Environmental Consequences:  
Having read the EIS, it is difficult for me to comment on each specific point as I am not a scientist. However, I have read it along with other documents from groups such as the Coalition for Beach Access. As a life long resident of North Carolina I have, for my entire life, enjoyed the recreational opportunities offered by the Cape Hatteras National Seashore and Recreational Area. I support the fact that reasonable and safe pedestrian and vehicular access to the beach is essential to participate and enjoy these resources and opportunities. I also support restrictions and conditions necessary to protect the birds, sea turtles, and other biota that are supported by scientific data and can make the Seashore home for part of the year. I believe the favor alternative (#7) advanced by the NPS is more restrictive than necessary to meet protection of the Seashore. I have read and agree with the proposal to manage ORV's on the Seashore prepared and submitted for consideration by the Coalition for Beach Access. My position is that the NPS accept this alternative or at least postpone a final decision on the ORV Plan pending further review and negotiation on the counter points raised by the Coalition for Beach Access."

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3235    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Abbott, Bud  
**Received:** May.04,2010 15:57:17  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am a resident of North Carolina who enjoys recreational opportunities offered by the Cape Hatteras National Seashore and Recreational Area. Reasonable and safe pedestrian and vehicular access to the beach is essential to participate and enjoy these resources and opportunities. I also support restrictions and conditions necessary to protect the birds, sea turtles, and other biota that are supported by scientific data and can make the Seashore home for part of the year. I believe the favor alternative (#7) advanced by the NPS is more restrictive than necessary to meet protection of the Seashore.

0009688

I have read and agree with the proposal to manage ORV's on the Seashore prepared and submitted for consideration by the Coalition for Beach Access. My position is that the NPS accept this alternative or at least postpone a final decision on the ORV Plan pending further review and negotiation on the counter points raised by the Coalition for Beach Access.

Sincerely,  
Bud Abbott

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3236	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596		
<b>Name:</b>	Young, Thomas H						
<b>Received:</b>	May,04,2010 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Reference Draft ORV Management Plan/EIS, Table 53: Sea Turtles. While I am no scientist, I have read the document along with other documents with different opinions and stated facts. One such document provided by the Coalition for Beach Access has been submitted for review. I am a resident of North Carolina who enjoys recreational opportunities offered by the Cape Hatteras National Seashore and Recreational Area. Reasonable and safe pedestrian and vehicular access to the beach is essential to participate and enjoy these resources and opportunities. I also support restrictions and conditions necessary to protect the birds, sea turtles, and other biota that are supported by scientific data and can make the Seashore home for part of the year. I believe the favor alternative (#7) advanced by the NPS is more restrictive than necessary to meet protection of the Seashore. I have read and agree with the proposal to manage ORV's on the Seashore prepared and submitted for consideration by the Coalition for Beach Access. My position is that the NPS accept this alternative or at least postpone a final decision on the ORV Plan pending further review and negotiation on the counter points raised by the Coalition for Beach Access."						

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3237	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,04,2010 16:02:45						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please use science based management when developing a plan for ORV on Cape Lookout Nat'l PArk. While there are bans in place already to protect nesting birds and wildlife, more beach area should be designated specifically for wildlife habitat during those months critical to their survival(spring/)This is a very sensitive topic and there is room for everyone, however,man"dominion" over wildlife will surely desicrate what we have left. Let's give wildlife a fighting chance. It has already been shown that their numbers will recover whe given half a chance.						

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3238	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,04,2010 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	"I am a resident of North Carolina who enjoys recreational opportunities offered by the Cape Hatteras National Seashore and Recreational Area. Reasonable and safe pedestrian and vehicular access to the beach is essential to participate and enjoy these resources and opportunities. I also support restrictions and conditions necessary to protect the birds, sea turtles, and other biota that are supported by scientific data and can make the Seashore home for part of the year. I believe the favor alternative (#7) advanced by the NPS is more restrictive than necessary to meet protection of the Seashore. I have read and agree with the proposal to manage ORV's on the Seashore prepared and submitted for consideration by the Coalition for Beach Access. My position is that the NPS accept this alternative or at least postpone a final decision on the ORV Plan pending further review and negotiation on the counter points raised by the Coalition for Beach Access." It seems clear with recreational area as part of the name itself that this should be the major emphasis of how this area was intended to be used.						

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3239	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,04,2010 16:04:29						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	With more and more restictions of freedom in the world I was dissapointed to see that there were thoughts of restricting kitesurfing in the Hatteras area - a world renowned awesome kitesurfing spot (I know about it and I am from New Zealand). It is important that young people have the freedom to enjoy affordable healthy sports such as kitesurfing for both body and mind. Targeting kitesurfing is bizzare as in the relative sceme of things it has such an insignificant impact in comparison to other human based impacts on areas like this. I support kitesurfers and their fuel free fun, which I think is a good lesson for everyone. I oppose any attempts at ANY restriction to ANY of the area for kitesurfers. It is a real shame because I hear more and more of my friends around the world just simply brush off the US nowadays as a visiting destination because the talk is all of freedom and yet when you arrive it seems that this freedom only applies to certain people, in this instance maybe a bunch of bird watchers that had their hayday 30 years ago and have maybe forgotten that their generation was responsible for messing up the environment in the first place - and now they want to take away one of the few freedoms many young people enjoy that does not involve fossil fuels and a great deal of money. Spend more time targeting the essential environment priorities and stop picking on the kitesurfers!						

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3240	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,04,2010 16:08:52						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	"I am a resident of North Carolina who enjoys recreational opportunities offered by the Cape Hatteras National Seashore and Recreational Area. Reasonable and safe pedestrian and vehicular access to the beach is essential to participate and enjoy these resources and opportunities. I also support restrictions and conditions necessary to protect the birds, sea turtles, and other biota that are supported by scientific data and can make the Seashore home for part of the year. I believe the favor alternative (#7) advanced by the NPS is more restrictive than necessary to meet protection of the Seashore. I have read and agree with the proposal to manage ORV's on the Seashore prepared and submitted for consideration by the Coalition for Beach Access. My position is that the NPS accept this alternative or at least postpone a final decision on the ORV Plan pending further review and negotiation on the counter points raised by the Coalition for Beach Access."						

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3241	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596		
<b>Name:</b>	Chihill, Paula						
<b>Received:</b>	May,04,2010 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Hello. I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the 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 ask that any plan that is approved will do the following: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only						

0009689

16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families 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. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals 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:** 3242    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Cowal, Nancy S

**Received:** May,04,2010 16:13:07

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Thank you for taking the time to listen to public comments concerning the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Hatteras Island has been my home for 35 years. I have taught at Cape Hatteras School for 25 of those years and am concerned for the future of the Island and its children. I hope my words will influence the choice of plan.

We need access for all kinds of beach users. Many visitors and residents alike need non\_ORV sections so they can walk an unrutted beach, or play catch with their children, or investigate the various beach ecological zones, or hit a favorite fishing spot, or enjoy some solitude with the sound of the waves. ORV areas should not be designated in any more than one half of the Seashore to allow for safe and peaceful pedestrian access and better protection of wildlife. Wildlife protection should be the foremost concern in this Park, as set when it was originally created.

Since this protection has gone by the wayside in recent years, a recovery plan that is focused on reducing disturbance to nesting, migrating, and wintering birds, to nesting and hatching turtles, and to plant habitat should be a component of the Park's goals.

None of the proposed plans offer enough ORV-free area, but PLAN D is closest to what my family would prefer and what we urge you to put into effect.

Sincerely, Nancy Cowal

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3243    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,04,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. We ask that any plan that is approved will do the following:

Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families 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. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3244    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,04,2010 16:17:14

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** General comment on the document with specific reference to Chapter 2: Alternatives. As a member of CCA, I support the work done by the CCA along with the Coalition for Beach Access which has supplied an extensive document with other alternatives detailed. As a CCA member, I support reasonable and safe pedestrian and vehicular access to the beach as it is essential to participate and enjoy the park resources and opportunities. I also support restrictions and conditions necessary to protect the birds, sea turtles, and other biota that are supported by scientific data and can make the Seashore home for part of the year. I believe the favor alternative (#7) advanced by the NPS is more restrictive than necessary to meet protection of the Seashore. I have read and agree with the proposal to manage ORV's on the Seashore prepared and submitted for consideration by the Coalition for Beach Access. My position is that the NPS accept this alternative or at least postpone a final decision on the ORV Plan pending further review and negotiation on the counter points raised by the Coalition for Beach Access."

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3245    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,04,2010 16:24:21

**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 as a nature photographer. The Outer Banks are a critical environment for wildlife and without the wildlife they would be a far lesser place.

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

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

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be

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

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3246    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Carmon, Michelle  
**Received:** May,04,2010 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. We ask that any plan that is approved will do the following:  
 Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families 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. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
 Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
 Thank you for doing your part to help protect the beauty of our state's precious land.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3247    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,04,2010 16:39:18  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3248    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,04,2010 16:46:58  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Automobiles, gas vehicles do not mix well with the beach environment. The sand is not lifeless. There are so many organisms that are disturbed even when people wander around. Fast vehicles are very dangerous. Please don't allow vehicles on beaches.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3249    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,04,2010 16:49:53  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I disagree with the NPS proposal for around the clock beach closure from nest to surfline (pg 125) for turtles. These large closures deny access to large areas of the beach confining many visitors to limited sections in front of the villages. Many people visit the Recreational Area to enjoy the open beaches. Beach closures do not allow open beaches. Last August, the beaches were crowded and it was difficult to get from one place to another because of the beach closures. There was no direct route anywhere. Turtles hatch and move to the sea at night, usually by the full moon. Large, around the clock closures are unnecessary and punitive to visitors. A 10 meter square enclosure during the day is adequate for the safety of the turtles and would allow access to open areas thus eliminating crowding.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3250    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Cowal, Nancy S  
**Received:** May,04,2010 16:52:09  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Why I Recommend Plan D  
 I like to walk the beach and I like to drive the beach. And each year I see more and more vehicles. The Park is overrun with ORV vehicles! The number of visitors to the Park has grown to gigantic proportions in the last 20 years. The idea of free access, anywhere on our beaches, is sadly a concept from yesterday. Today the huge number of vehicles has to be regulated. We are ruining the very thing we love by giving free rein to so much traffic and use. Who will even want to visit a beach that looks like a parking lot, that exudes the fumes of hundreds of gas/diesel engines, that crowds the beaches with gear and trash? This is happening right now! Recently, I was walking the shoreline toward the Point, in an area that traditionally had been closed to vehicles but lately opened. I was careful about staying out of the way of vehicles and avoiding fishing rods in their holders. Even so, I walked right into an invisible monofilament line coming from one of several unattended rods, catching me by the neck. The owner of the line was roused from his vehicle and was somewhat annoyed. There wasn't much enjoyment on that walk. And as much as the vehicle owner was enjoying the beach, he could have been sitting in the Food Lion parking lot.  
 At last the Park is designing plans for ORV use. Please consider restricting at least half of the Seashore from vehicle use so that the rights of citizens who want a non-motorized experience can be upheld, so that all visitors can have a choice of experience. Cape Hatteras National Seashore officials must know that it is a dangerous precedent for all Parks to allow one interest group to dictate how this Park will be used.  
 The description of the various plans does not seem to accurately portray them. The Park's preferred plan (F) only accommodates users of vehicles. Surely designating only 3 miles of beach year round for non-motorized use is not best option for all citizens. Calling combined pedestrian/ORV areas pedestrian use area is a misrepresentation and should not be an option either. PLAN D, amended with extended pedestrian use and greater wildlife protection, looks to be the best of all the plans and the one I would ask you to consider putting into effect.  
 Sincerely, Nancy Cowal

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3251	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,04,2010 16:57:56						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Riding along the beach is not the way to preserve nature for future generations. We now have an environmental tragedy occurring in the Gulf of Mexico, don't let this happen in another way by guys who need a testosterone surge by revving their overly loud boy toys. Stop this before you realize that you can't go back.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3252	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	
<b>Name:</b>	Stanback, Fred						
<b>Received:</b>	May,04,2010 17:08:27						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please ban driving on the beach. Vehicles kill bird and turtle nests, and should not be on the beach which belongs to the public.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3253	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,04,2010 17:09:12						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I am a resident of North Carolina who enjoys recreational opportunities offered by the Cape Hatteras National Seashore and Recreational Area. Reasonable and safe pedestrian and vehicular access to the beach is essential to participate and enjoy these resources and opportunities. I also support restrictions and conditions necessary to protect the birds, sea turtles, and other biota that are supported by scientific data and can make the Seashore home for part of the year. I believe the favor alternative (#7) advanced by the NPS is more restrictive than necessary to meet protection of the Seashore. I have read and agree with the proposal to manage ORV's on the Seashore prepared and submitted for consideration by the Coalition for Beach Access. My position is that the NPS accept this alternative or at least postpone a final decision on the ORV Plan pending further review and negotiation on the counter points raised by the Coalition for Beach Access." Sincerely, mortimer lomax						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3254	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,04,2010 17:13:03						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	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. We all deserve equal access and a safe space on a national park beach. The EIS should address this concern.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3255	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,04,2010 17:24:35						
<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>	3256	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	
<b>Name:</b>	Walton, Clarence						
<b>Received:</b>	May,04,2010 17:32:57						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please eliminate off-road vehicles on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Protect the animals and vegetation.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3257	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,04,2010 17:33:48						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I support Alternative D as presented in the draft environmental impact statement. However, I would like to see more pedestrian access added to this alternative. Thank you for your consideration.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3258	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	
<b>Name:</b>	OBXPIRATE, Woody						

**Received:** May,04,2010 17:34:28

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Mr. Murray I totally disagree and find none of the alternatives of the DEIS acceptable. This is a 800 page document written by lawyers and enviromental special interest groups and is intentionally confusing. Below are specifics I DO NOT AGREE WITH.  
 1. Bad science 2. closures to large and unprecedented 3. permanent closure of points and inlets 4. No pets allowed 5. ban on night driving 6. no ORV and pedestrian corridors to open beach areas 7. birds and turtles protected that are not endangered 8. no ideas from the pro access groups involved in the NEGREG  
 I do however support the much simpler and fair 77 page Coalition for Beach Access Position Statement submitted by pro access groups that were part of NEGREG. This fars succeeds in protecting the resource and allowing the best visitor experience and use of public tax payer lands.  
 Please consider all aspects this alternative proposal and put the people back in charge of Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area.  
 Woody Dreher, Tax Payer Owner of public lands

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3259    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Elliott, Lynn M

**Received:** May,04,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the 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 ask that any plan that is approved will do the following:  
 Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families 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. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
 Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals 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:** 3260    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Raper, Connie K

**Received:** May,04,2010 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. We ask that any plan that is approved will do the following:  
 Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families 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. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
 Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals 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:** 3261    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Chrystal, John

**Received:** May,04,2010 17:46:40

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** As a member of many of the organizations on opposite sides of this issue I feel I have a good balance in my views on this issue. First, not all beach drivers are the same, for the most part, members of such organizations such as NCBBA, while not perfect, are much more aware of other people's and animal's rights and stress proper beach driving "decorum". Secondly, the article in Audubon on the destruction of the beach environment painted all ORV drivers in the same brush stroke. Bad move! Next, the reaction of the NCBBA leadership to that article was equally as bad. It seems that most of these groups should be looking for solutions that allow for all groups and species to have their time on the beach, rather than all this nastiness (from the people not the "lower" animals). In addition, we all need to be looking at sea level rise due to climate change and how to avoid losing the beaches altogether. I have been driving, fishing, and nature observing on the beaches of NC for 40 years and would like to continue to do so, but I am willing to be flexible about when and where I do it!  
 John Chrystal

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3262    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

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

**Received:** May,04,2010 17:54:03

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am 44 years old. I grew up in Florida, now live in DC and NC, and have spent over 40 years relaxing, swimming, surfing, and fishing on the beaches of FL and Hatteras Island, NC.  
 I consider myself an environmentalist who strives to enjoy and protect the environment. I don't kill anything unless it is legal and I plan to eat it as part of my balanced diet that has resulted in a healthy BMI of 25 - I am 6'3" and 200 lb. I love the outdoors and will do all I can to protect it and my right to enjoy it.

0009693

I disagree with any beach management approach that would prevent human access to and recreational use of beaches. There are always ways that human activities can be managed to allow human presence while protecting any natural resource, be it birds or turtles or other living organism.

I disagree with the NPS Preferred Alternative F as it is too restrictive of human recreational access with no proven need for this level of restriction.

I agree with the positions established by the Coalition for Beach Access (see <http://www.obpa-nc.org/position/statement.pdf> and <http://www.obpa-nc.org/position/assessment.pdf>).

I agree with the positions established by Dare County, NC (see <http://www.hatteraslandtimes.com/PDFs/DCDEIS.pdf>).

There is no proven scientific basis that any shorebird requires a 1,000 meter or other large buffer to prevent harm from human presence. Any buffer requirement should start small, such as 20 meters, and only be increased based on video-documented evidence that the existing buffer size is insufficient to prevent physical harm to the species. Harm should not include occasional "defensive posturing" or other movements, including flight.

Pedestrian foot traffic such as anglers, surfers, beachcombers, runners, etc., as are customarily seen on beaches, should always be allowed on beaches and should be afforded much smaller buffers than vehicles. No closures should include a ban on foot traffic/pedestrians as there is no evidence that shorebirds or other species are harmed in any way by pedestrians given a small buffer from nesting activity.

Outer Banks NPS-managed beaches should be an example of smart co-existence and management practices, not extremist bans and management practices driven by fear of punitive law suits.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3263    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.04,2010 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 mother with young children, I respectfully ask that you consider the needs of non-ORV users of the beaches. Our family regards the preservation of wildlife habitat as important, and would prefer Alternative D because it would result in less disturbance of wildlife.  
Please consider the following in the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Please consider the needs of pedestrians and families, not just the ORV users of the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. I ask this not only on behalf of my young children, but also for the generations to come.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Superintendent Murray, I thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. My family and I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3264    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Marraccini, Jerry  
**Received:** May.04,2010 17:58:23  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am a resident of North Carolina who enjoys recreational opportunities offered by the Cape Hatteras National Seashore and Recreational Area. Reasonable and safe pedestrian and vehicular access to the beach is essential to participate and enjoy these resources and opportunities. I also support restrictions and conditions necessary to protect the birds, sea turtles, and other biota that are supported by scientific data and can make the Seashore home for part of the year. I believe the favor alternative (#7) advanced by the NPS is more restrictive than necessary to meet protection of the Seashore. I have read and agree with the proposal to manage ORV's on the Seashore prepared and submitted for consideration by the Coalition for Beach Access. My position is that the NPS accept this alternative or at least postpone a final decision on the ORV Plan pending further review and negotiation on the counter points raised by the Coalition for Beach Access

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3265    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.04,2010 18:01:06  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I love the beaches in North Carolina, and would hate to see them disappear as a result of allowing ORV's to continue to use them. I have personally been in an SUV to go to Carolina beach, but, if the convenience of driving on the beach is also destroying it, then I feel it should stop. People will continue to use the beach, they will just have to walk. Nothing wrong with Americans getting more exercise! Please consider our beaches as the precious resources that they are. Sincerely, Teresa Hart

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3266    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.04,2010 18:01:59  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I've been coming to Ocracoke and enjoying the beaches for swimming and fishing since 1964 (before the Oregon Inlet Bridge). I'm concerned that overly restrictive regulation of beach access will diminish the enjoyment of this wonderful vacation paradise and hurt business owners who are trying to get back on their feet after 2 years of recession.  
I acknowledge that regulations protecting shore birds and turtles have been lax in the past, and I'm glad that steps are being taken to help them. Just, please don't go to far in regulating vehicle, pedestrian and pet traffic on the beaches, or you'll chase lifetime visitors like myself to Va. and SC.  
Thanks for your consideration

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3267    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Roberts, Karen L  
**Received:** May.04,2010 18:04:13  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** To Whom it May Concern, Since retirement we have been looking forward to spending alot more time on the Outer Banks. We even put a trailer there year round. We have since sold the trailer since our time has been cut short. I get sick to my stomach when I think about the people of the Outer Banks having to suffer because the piping plovers and oyster catchers have more rights than they do. I believe that we can coexist on the island. Why do think the birds would nest and lay eggs near truck traffic. It makes them feel safe from predator and I mean the 4 legged ones not the 4 wheel ones. I have friends that live on the island and are in fear of losing their homes and lively hoods. I don't understand how the audoban society members can sleep at night. I'm not sure they have a consience or they shouldn't be able to live with themselves for what they have done in the name of birds. They have no interest in working with us. They want to shut the beaches down simply because they think they can. Now they are selling property near Corolla that was deeded to them simply because they say they need the money. I'm getting upset just writing this. Please, listen to us. We are not out to hurt or

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3268	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,04,2010 18:05:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	the cape hatteras recreation area was set aside as a place for the people to enjoy . there hasn"t been any problems on the obx till this lawsuit . people love and respect nature and can live right beside of it, just look around . the tide lines are no place for man or beasts if you want to nest there . the tide will consume you . let the people enjoy,they don"t have much left .we are losing our country as we speak to people with money . the people with no money can lose everything they dreamed about . i love the obx beaches and ocean and spend approx \$ 8000.00 per yr to rent houses and boat there . if i can"t go to the beach i guess the locals will file for food stamps as i am only one of millions that go there for one reason . THE BEACH ! hope the birds have a nice day . the people aren"t .						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3269	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,04,2010 18:08:12						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	"I am a resident of North Carolina who enjoys recreational opportunities offered by the Cape Hatteras National Seashore and Recreational Area. Reasonable and safe pedestrian and vehicular access to the beach is essential to participate and enjoy these resources and opportunities. I also support restrictions and conditions necessary to protect the birds, sea turtles, and other biota that are supported by scientific data and can make the Seashore home for part of the year. I believe the favor alternative (#7) advanced by the NPS is more restrictive than necessary to meet protection of the Seashore. I have read and agree with the proposal to manage ORV's on the Seashore prepared and submitted for consideration by the Coalition for Beach Access. My position is that the NPS accept this alternative or at least postpone a final decision on the ORV Plan pending further review and negotiation on the counter points raised by the Coalition for Beach Access."						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3270	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,04,2010 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please, no ORVs, for goodness sakes! I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the 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 ask that any plan that is approved will do the following: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families 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. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3271	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,04,2010 18:10:51						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please keep all vehicles off the National Seashore beaches at all times! They are noisy, polluting and potentially dangerous to visitors and wildlife alike. They detract significantly from the natural environment that you are chartered to protect for every citizen's benefit. Thank you. Jim Richardson						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3272	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	
<b>Name:</b>	leonard, jack						
<b>Received:</b>	May,04,2010 18:11:22						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	why is it that after one year plus,NO persons have been apprehended for violating secured wildlife area?? don't you care?? with only 20 or so beach accesses for orv's it seems simple to have monitor cameras at each access point. heck Dare County would probably pay for them out of thier tourist tax.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3273	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	
<b>Name:</b>	Davis, Frederick N						
<b>Received:</b>	May,04,2010 18:14:34						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	"I am a resident of North Carolina who enjoys recreational opportunities offered by the Cape Hatteras National Seashore and Recreational Area. Reasonable and safe pedestrian and vehicular access to the beach is essential to participate and enjoy these resources and opportunities. I also support restrictions and conditions necessary to protect the birds, sea turtles, and other biota that are supported by scientific data and can make the Seashore home for part of the year. I believe the favor alternative (#7) advanced by the NPS is more restrictive than necessary to meet protection of the Seashore. I have read and agree with the proposal to manage ORV's on the Seashore prepared and submitted for consideration by the Coalition for Beach Access. My position is that the NPS accept this alternative or at least postpone a final decision on the ORV Plan pending further review and negotiation on the counter points raised by the Coalition for Beach Access." Sincerely, Capt. Fred Davis						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3274	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	
<b>Name:</b>	Weller, Steven J						
<b>Received:</b>	May,04,2010 18:15:12						

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** We have been vacationing to the Buxton, Frisco & Hatteras areas for the past 15 years, mostly at the end of May or beginning of June. Our family enjoys spending hours and hours on the beaches fishing, playing in the sand & water and walking our dogs while we're on vacation. The beaches there are nice to have the dogs with us instead of leaving them with someone or in a kennel because they are part of our family. With the DEIS we would not be allowed to have our pets on the beach between 3-15 thru 7-31 (that is when we vacation every year).  
 I don't understand why Oyster catchers can get so much area closed since they are not endangered or threatened. They are "used" to close more beach every year making our fishing areas smaller & smaller. The Piping Plover gets up to 1000 meters - WHY? Why not have an ORV corridor? Why is it OK to move turtle nests when a storm is coming but not any other time?  
 We have vacationed to Hatteras Island many times and had planned on continuing to vacation there forever. While we're still young we talked about eventually buying a beach house there - that is how much we LOVE Hatteras Island. However, with the DEIS our love for Hatteras Island will be gone. We will not be able to enjoy fishing as we have in the past and we will not be able to bring our dogs along for long walks on the beach. If all of this stuff happens Hatteras Island will lose our yearly contribution to their local economy. I know we are not the only people that will stop vacationing there due to this. There are wonderful restaurants and quaint little shops all over Hatteras Island that will suffer. I urge you to reconsider and allow the beaches to stay open as they are or were in the past so my family and so many other families can continue to enjoy Hatteras Island as we have for the past 15 years!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3275    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,04,2010 18:15:26  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I disagree with the socio-economic data and analysis p. 270-286 and 561-598. It is incomplete and erroneous data and therefore I am becoming the endangered species of Hatteras Island. My income and access to the beaches has been drastically affected. Your soon to be extinct species, Thomas S. Sarkisian

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3276    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Sarkisian, Mary C  
**Received:** May,04,2010 18:22:42  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I disagree with the socio-economic analysis and data on p.270-286 and p. 561-598. The information is incomplete and erroneous and therefore is endangering me on Hatteras Island. My income and access to the beaches has been drastically affected. Sincerely, Mary C. Sarkisian

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3277    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,04,2010 18:24:59  
**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:** 3278    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Gray, Richard L  
**Received:** May,04,2010 18:26:20  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** "I am a resident of North Carolina who enjoys recreational opportunities offered by the Cape Hatteras National Seashore and Recreational Area. Reasonable and safe pedestrian and vehicular access to the beach is essential to participate and enjoy these resources and opportunities. I also support restrictions and conditions necessary to protect the birds, sea turtles, and other biota that are supported by scientific data and can make the Seashore home for part of the year. I believe the favor alternative (#7) advanced by the NPS is more restrictive than necessary to meet protection of the Seashore. I have read and agree with the proposal to manage ORV's on the Seashore prepared and submitted for consideration by the Coalition for Beach Access. My position is that the NPS accept this alternative or at least postpone a final decision on the ORV Plan pending further review and negotiation on the counter points raised by the Coalition for Beach Access."  
 Copied - as you must recognize - from a CCA form.n

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3279    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** May,04,2010 18:37:16  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** "I am a resident of North Carolina who enjoys recreational opportunities offered by the Cape Hatteras National Seashore and Recreational Area. Reasonable and safe pedestrian and vehicular access to the beach is essential to participate and enjoy these resources and opportunities. I also support restrictions and conditions necessary to protect the birds, sea turtles, and other biota that are supported by scientific data and can make the Seashore home for part of the year. I believe the favor alternative (#7) advanced by the NPS is more restrictive than necessary to meet protection of the Seashore. I have read and agree with the proposal to manage ORV's on the Seashore prepared and submitted for consideration by the Coalition for Beach Access. My position is that the NPS accept this alternative or at least postpone a final decision on the ORV Plan pending further review and negotiation on the

counter points raised by the Coalition for Beach Access."  
Sincerely Andrew Sewell

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3280    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** May,04,2010 18:47:29  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Persons who want to enjoy the peace and quiet of the National Seashore cannot do so with ORV's running around all over the place. They are noisy, pollute the air and are not in keeping with what folks want to experience at the beach. How much damage do they contribute to the sand and are they allowed on the dunes??? Why should all of the people who visit the seashore have to be overruled by a minority of folks who want to run these machines when they should not be allowed. JUST SAY NO TO ORV'S ON OUR BEACHES!!!!!!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3281    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,04,2010 18:50:42  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** 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.  
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).  
I agree with the need to ask the question: Why has NPS never made public a list of reported incidents? Because ? 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)  
I disagree with the statement made by NPS: Shorter Off-Season ORV access on South-facing Villages (p. xix)  
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)  
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)  
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). (Bodie Island & Ocracoke -260 vehicles per mile and Cape Point 7400 vehicles per mile). This seems to be in conflict with the earlier assessment made by NPS regarding "Carrying Capacity". 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)  
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)  
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? By eliminating this vast stretch of beach which is already off limits to ORV access it makes the beach parcels they intend on closing look like a smaller percentage of the overall resource area under closure to ORV.  
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 NPS definition that Large, Inflexible Buffers be used, (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. If the area is closed around the clock from the nest to the surf line, it cuts off all access. Closing all the way to surf line blocks access to the entire beach. It would be better managed if the access were allowed to pass below the nest near the surf..  
I agree with a Closure to surf line from 1 hour before sunset until dawn, monitored by Turtle Night Nest Watch Team because the proposed Night Driving Restrictions Penalize Pedestrian and ORV users. Education and awareness are the most beneficial to all parties involved. Simply eliminating access is not "managing" the resource. And the resource is supposed to be available to all parties.  
I disagree with the NPS barriers 105 meters wide (p.125) This cuts off all access and one nest at the beginning of two consecutive ramps would block the entire section of beach between the two ramps. This does not take into account allof the beach between two different nests that are cut off completely because the blockage is all the way to the surf line leaving zero passage. I agree with the statement that "Closure should be 10 meters square during the day" This a more effective to allow for access. The plan should cover off-road vehicle access, not total off-road vehicle elimination. Eliminating access is not "managing" it.  
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.  
It is perfectly acceptable to have dogs tethered utilizing the six foot leash rule.  
I disagree with the NPS position: "Even with resource closures in place, protected species are still at risk [from pedestrians and ORVs]." (p. 210)  
I agree with facts related to current ORV access that:  
? 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.  
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?  
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 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

The inclusion of the Northern Beaches in analysis significantly dilutes estimates of economic impact on the Seashore Villages.

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.

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 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"

? This is all conjecture on the part of NPS. There is no documented evidence to support their accusations. They are merely speculating on a worst case scenario. Education and awareness are the best tools for the job here. An educated informed public addresses the true spirit of "managed" resource as opposed to total elimination of beach access, which requires no "management". ? 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 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).

I disagree with the NPS assessment of Restrictive Species Management Areas (p. 468) Where they state:

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 & ORV corridor thru SMA at Cape Point, South Point

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 & nesting season (within guidelines) to maintain access.

I disagree with the NPS assessment of Limited Pedestrian and ORV Corridors (p. 468) because:

NPS: Only recognized in ML2 managed SMAs NPS: SMA management reverts to standard buffers when bird breeding activity first observed

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.

**Correspondence ID:** 3282 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Klett, Henry N

**Received:** May,04,2010 18:51:36

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am a resident of North Carolina who enjoys recreational opportunities offered by the Cape Hatteras National Seashore and Recreational Area. Reasonable and safe pedestrian and vehicular access to the beach is essential to participate and enjoy these resources and opportunities. I also support restrictions and conditions necessary to protect the birds, sea turtles, and other biota that are supported by scientific data and can make the Seashore home for part of the year. I believe the favor alternative (#7) advanced by the NPS is more restrictive than necessary to meet protection of the Seashore. I have read and agree with the proposal to manage ORV's on the Seashore prepared and submitted for consideration by the Coalition for Beach Access. My position is that the NPS accept this alternative or at least postpone a final decision on the ORV Plan pending further review and negotiation on the counter points raised by the Coalition for Beach Access."

Sincerely,  
Henry Klett

**Correspondence ID:** 3283 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,04,2010 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. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until 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:** 3284    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,04,2010 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.  
The following principles should guide formulation of the National Park Service 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. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas year round that are free of ORV use. Such areas are crucial for wildlife-- breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. The management targets in the DEIS need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where annual reviews show that birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals--and adequate management to realize them--should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3285    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** White, Robert O  
**Received:** May,04,2010 18:57:11  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I support in its entirety the comments submitted by the Dare County Board of Commissioners on this subject. Robert O. White One Kingfisher Court Kitty Hawk, NC 27949 Tel: 252-255-0914

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3286    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,04,2010 19:01:20  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** On pages 121-127 Non-dangered species, such as the Colonial Waterbirds, Oystercatchers, and Least Terns are given pre-nesting closures and buffers up to 300 meters. Why are birds not list as endangered given the level of protection as the ones in the ESA (Endangered Species Act). Does not create more work for NPS and increase beach closures not necessary? Should these not be given lesser buffer ares maybe 30 meters?  
On page 486 corridors are only allowed in ML-2 portions of SMA's and are subject to resource closures at any time. Should corridors not be allowed throughout the seashore during the entire breeding and nesting season including ML-1 portions of SMA's.  
Again on pages 121-127 Buffers are larger than required by species recovery plans. This creates larger closures limiting the benefit to the general public and creating more work for NPS.  
Overall I appreciate the effort put forth to create such a document as this. A few areas appear to skew the recommendations more toward the wildlife side and away from the recreational side. Please reconsider the closures/buffers using more realist terms for some of the wildlife mentioned.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3287    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Crawford, Morgan H  
**Received:** May,04,2010 19:02:30  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please do not allow any vehicle on the beach!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3288    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Clark, Patricia  
**Received:** May,04,2010 19:11:06  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** The accommodations for the handicapped as described on page 58 are woefully inadequate, and certainly not in compliance with the existing Americans with Disabilities Act. That act provides that ALL public facilities should be accessible to those disabled. Three ramps out of ? doesnt comply. If the "special use permitting" is implemented, how are the handicapped going to "call" their transportation back. How about bathroom facilities since it seems it will take an hour or more to get transportation back. If the issue is the ORvs, this doubles or triples the beach transportation miles. This provision is wrong on almost all levels.  
Also many disabled Americans require assistance dogs - like my MS - not just the visually impaired.  
This section, if implemented, will surely be opposed by the Justice Dept.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3289    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private

**Received:** May,04,2010 19:20:18  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I vacationed on Hatteras Island for the first time this past summer and found it an amazingly beautiful place that I would definitely return to. I think it's ridiculous to allow driving on the beach. We have roads for driving. Vehicles on the beach make the beach an unsafe and unpleasant place for people who are trying to recreate, walk, beachcomb, swim, etc. What a miserable place the beach would be if everyone drove their car on it. Seriously. Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3290    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,04,2010 19:24:10  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Thank you for allowing public input on the question of whether or not ORV's should be allowed on National Park land. My vote is a strong "No". I don't think any gas-powered recreational vehicles should be allowed in public parks. The few who want to use them should not be allowed to punish the rest of us. I believe our public parks should be sanctuaries from the noise and pollution. Not only are we humans disturbed by off-road vehicles, but think of the wildlife we are supposed to be protecting. Their senses are much keener than ours, and I think the stresses from noise and odor would interfere with the life-cycles of these "protected" wildlife. I also think that off-road vehicles are dangerous, not only to their own drivers (!), but to any who get in their way. I really hope you will consider closing Hatteras to any gas-powered recreational vehicles. I'm sure there will be a few noisy people who will insist on their way, but Hatteras was never meant to be a place for ORV's. Nor should any National Park allow them. It just isn't fair to the rest of us. I see no reason why horseback riding, hiking, and so forth can't be allowed, maybe even electric vehicles, but not near or in the dunes. We must protect what little we have left. If you will not ban ORV's on our National Seashore, then perhaps you will better plan a buffer zone so that Hatteras will one day again attract wildlife and vegetation that once called Hatteras home. It is up to you to think of future generations enjoying Hatteras, not just a few 4-wheeler owners now. Thanks you for your consideration. Regards, Letitia Yarborough

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3291    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,04,2010 19:24:39  
**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.  
Natural areas and wildlife are incredibly important resources that help the planet and enrich our lives.  
It is our job to make sure that human activity doesn't wipe out all of the wildlife around us, which we are very capable of doing.  
Measures need to be taken to ensure the healthy survival of plovers and sea turtles.  
While I believe this is true regardless of economics, I believe preserving the wildlife and keeping some areas quieter (ie reducing ATV use) increases the value for many National Park visitors. I certainly wouldn't pay to visit an area overrun by ATVs, but would pay substantial amounts to visit quiet, natural areas with wildlife.  
Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3292    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,04,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV's) use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D of all the alternatives considered. I support it with modifications to provide greater pedestrian access.  
It is essential that the adopted plan include:  
Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the NPS's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. At least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife if ORV use is allowed within the park. There should be more walkways and better access to provide balanced access for all visitors. It is essential that pedestrians and families be able to safely enjoy the Seashore. This approach would also give wildlife a better chance to breed and diversity in the park.  
Wildlife protection should come first with recreation subordinate. Given the unique nature of the Seashore, recreational use should be secondary to protection of the natural resources and wildlife. The preferred plan fails to set aside enough room free of ORV use year round for wildlife. They need essential breeding, migrating, and wintering areas for the diverse species that are seasonal and/or year-round residents. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are way too small to serve their intended functions and must be enlarged to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Goals for Wildlife Recovery must be clear and adequate to be effective. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.?

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3293    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Cherry, Robert P  
**Received:** May,04,2010 19:42:38  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am writing to comment on the ORV plan for Cape Hatteras National Seashore. I'm happy to see that this plan is finally coming to fruition and that the park is taking steps to protect their significant natural resources while still providing recreational opportunities for all users.  
I ask that you approve Alternative D, the environmentally preferred alternative. While I support this alternative I do have some concerns and think that it could be made even better than it already is.  
My main purpose for visiting the park has been bird-watching and other nature oriented activities. I appreciate that you have made strong efforts to protect wildlife, especially T&E species, but more can be done. The Organic Act states that the National Park Service shall conserve the natural resources for the enjoyment of future generations so this really is not an optional decision on the part of park management. I am concerned that past recreational activity on the beach has caused much damage to wildlife and vegetation. The recent beach closures have helped to correct this problem but these closures need to be strengthened and more areas need to be set aside for nesting and other activities by park wildlife. Research in the park has shown that these closures are needed to protect park resources and management decisions should be research-based first and politics-based second. I have had the pleasure of visiting the park, including trips with my family, with friends and on my own, on several occasions and enjoy walking and enjoying the quiet solitude that the beach offers. I am concerned that the plan does not provide enough of the beach for users who want to enjoy the quiet without having to deal with motorized vehicles. I believe the plan only excludes motorized vehicles from about 16 miles while allowing them on 52 miles. I would appreciate it if you would increase the amount of beach that is limited to non-motorized activities.  
Please select Alternative D with additions to strengthen protection of park resources. Even if Alternative D is not chosen please consider my

suggestions.  
Thank you for your attention to this mater.?

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3294	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,04,2010 19:44:57						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>To whom it may concern: As a homeowner on Cape Hattaras, we would like to request that you consider access to the beaches especially for homeowners and for the people who love and visit beautiful Cape Hattaras. It is our hope that you will consider the human factor and do the right thing by continuing to let people enjoy the land and the beauty that it brings. The parks are the people's parks. We all pay for them. Now we ask that you do the right thing and vote in favor of the people who want to visit Cape Hattaras.</p> <p>Best regards, Mary Brewer</p>						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3295	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,04,2010 19:47:22						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>I am a resident of North Carolina who enjoys recreational opportunities offered by the Cape Hatteras National Seashore and Recreational Area. Reasonable and safe pedestrian and vehicular access to the beach is essential to participate and enjoy these resources and opportunities. I also support restrictions and conditions necessary to protect the birds, sea turtles, and other biota that are supported by scientific data and can make the Seashore home for part of the year. I believe the favor alternative (#7) advanced the NPS is more restrictive to meet protection of the Seashore. I have read and agree with the proposal to manage ORV's on the Seashore prepared and submitted for consideration by the Coalition for Beach Access. My position is that the NPS accept this alternative or at least postpone a final decision on the ORV Plan pending further review and negotiation on the counter points raised by the Coalition for Beach Access.</p>						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3296	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596		
<b>Name:</b>	purser, jimmy						
<b>Received:</b>	May,04,2010 19:50:57						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>dear sirs; life is hard enough as it is, please don't make it any harder by severely restricting ORV use on our nat.seashores. I've been traveling to the outer banks to fish for over 40 yrs. admittedly times and people have changed a lot during this period of time and some of it not for the good. respect for the land and sea and its natural inhabitants seems to be lost for some of our younger generation. personally i fish ocrakoke and calo and when i see a lack of respect, and/or, common sense, i am not shy on pointing it out to the offender. sometimes this technique gets more results than any law or decree will ever do, especially if comes from one of their own rather than the government. i am getting too old to walk miles to a good fishing hole or any other hole like i used to and i would do my best to make sure that no one would act in a manner that would take away the privilege to drive on our beaches. please consider your older generation when devising your rules. they have a lot of knowledge and common sense to give back to you that could prove very helpful. respectfully: jimmy b purser</p>						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3297	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596		
<b>Name:</b>	Ostrander, Helen M						
<b>Received:</b>	May,04,2010 19:53:04						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>ORV's should not be allowed to operate any place where the habitat is fragile, where wildlife would be negatively impacted or where the purpose of the habitat is for human use, especially where children are found. ORV's are destructive to the environment. They need specific habitat created strictly for these type of vehicles situated far away from sensitive areas and children. The noise pollution alone is reason to ban their use. People want to find solitude in nature, not some noisy vehicle being driven by noisy people.</p>						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3298	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,04,2010 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 (pedestrian) uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.</p> <p>I have been a regular visitor to the Outer Banks for over 25 years and am distressed to see the degradation of the wildlife habitat and the beaches at Cape Point due to overuse by vehicles that seem not just heedless but downright hostile to pedestrians, birds, and anything else moving that is not in a truck. The beaches are unwalkable due to the deep ruts from vehicles and the experience for pedestrians is about as pleasant as walking on a busy street. While ORV activists protest loudly about driving on the beach as a 'traditional way of life', this tradition predates the high volume of vehicles that are currently driving on and tearing up the beach. It also serves to discourage and make unpleasant an even earlier traditional way of life - that of pedestrian use and enjoyment of the beach. I feel that there should be some give and take between vehicles, and wildlife and pedestrians, but I feel that the Park Service's preferred plan gives too much to the vocal minority that want to drive on the beach, and not enough to the other users of the beach - especially the wildlife.</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</p>						

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

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3299	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,04,2010 19:54:45						
<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>						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3300	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,04,2010 19:54:45						
<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>I am astounded that we would need to comment on maintaining our beautiful natural resources. Personally, I would ban ORVs entirely and pray that you will put a balanced plan into effect.</p> <p>Thank you. MM Johnston 5856 Old Oak Ridge Road Greensboro, NC 27410 3366177822</p>						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3301	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,04,2010 19:55:06						
<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>I prefer to hear waves, wind, birds, and maybe a radio when I go to the beach. I do not find it relaxing to listen to ORVs and breathe their exhaust. I will not visit Cape Hatteras National Seashore if doing so would mean I would have to deal with them.</p> <p>But more importantly, it would be a heartbreaking and irreversible loss to a beautiful, unique landscape. Rampant development and poorly-thought-out "renourishment" strategies are already damaging the beaches and threatening the wildlife that are the rightful heritage of every North Carolinian. Let's not add "increased access for ORVs" to the mix. Please choose Alternative D.</p>						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3302	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,04,2010 20:12:48						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>I would strongly like to see as much beach access as possible. These are our national parks and closure of areas to driving will prohibit fisherman from being able to access them. Furthermore the next step will be the closing of more and more areas, The business aspect or demise thereof will be devastating in an already anti-business era. We tax payers who love these shores and if I understand the Constitution, would actually be denied access to our own property and driving on it. We are also the ones who pick up trash and report abusers. To sum up QUIT taking our rights from us. GOD gave us domain over animals and every beast to manage and co-exist with. He also gave humans common sense, something that seems to have gone away in favor of government interfering with every aspect of our lives. We can't enjoy our parks anymore for constantly fighting for our right to use them. Let me be clear extend ORV access!!!!</p>						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3303	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	Shearon, Michael						
<b>Received:</b>	May,04,2010 20:19:28						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>My wife and I have owned a vacation home in Avon, NC for fifteen years. We have great affection for Hatteras Island and have visited many times. While we are not permanent residents we have vested interests. We know our home away from home is surrounded by the Cape Hatteras National Seashore RECREATIONAL Area. We love the area and support free and open beaches balanced with reasonable resource management. We feel that alternate "F" provides over protection of the wildlife over the public's right to access the beaches. In general buffer areas for the birds are too extensive and should be scaled back and access corridors should be provided as outlined in Dare County's DEIS Position Summary Statement. Please take into account the will of the people who live there and have the most to gain and lose. Do not be overly influenced by those that have a special agenda, huge financial resources, and their threats of lawsuits. Do the right thing for the people because it is consistent with protecting the wildlife.</p> <p>Respectfully, Michael &amp; Carolyn Shearon</p>						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3304	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y

**Name:** N/A, Blair L  
**Received:** May,04,2010 20:20:29  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** We are beach lovers and my wife is an NC native who has visited the OBX her whole life, I have been visiting there since I moved to NC in 1976. It is a great natural resource and driving on the beach is not a good use of this national seashore and public resource. Most people would rather walk and enjoy the beach and its peacefulness and the natural beauty. Please do not let the relatively small number who think it's their "right" to drive anywhere, be allowed to drive on our National Seashore or at the very least severely restrict the amount of driving and number of vehicles allowed. Let them park their SUV's etc. and learn to walk, haul their fishing gear themselves and enjoy what is all of ours and the birds, turtles and other creatures' to enjoy. Thanks for considering this point of view as you make the rules on driving on the outer banks.

**Correspondence ID:** 3305    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,04,2010 20:24:47  
**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:** 3306    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,04,2010 20:24:47  
**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:** 3307    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,04,2010 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.  
Bird watching and wildlife photography are hobbies of my husband and me. We travel all over the country visiting national parks, monuments and seashores. We have been to Cape Hatteras before and probably will visit again. We want this area to be managed for birds and wildlife as well as for other recreation, although we view ORV use as noisy and intrusive. 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.  
If 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. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. Birds and other wildlife are already suffering severe stress because of climate change and all sorts of other human caused problems. Do we really need to have ORVs driving through their nesting sites? When you choose the plan to manage Cape Hatteras, please consider all of the visitors who are there to view wildlife and birds and who want to do so in a safe and quiet environment. Thank you.

**Correspondence ID:** 3308    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,04,2010 20:24:47  
**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:** 3309    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,04,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Supt. Murray  
Please accept this letter as my comments on the ORV DEIS before you at this time.  
After reviewing the NPS DEIS I must disagree with any of the six alternatives within the document.  
I have; however, reviewed the 77 page Coalition for Beach Access Poaition Statement signed by several groups that were a part of the negotiated rule making process and it by far succeeds in furnishing the best visitor experience while maintaining the needs of protecting the fragile resources.  
Please consider all aspects of this alternative and put people back into the management of Cape Hatteras National Seashore.  
Sincerely Jeff Hilliard

**Correspondence ID:** 3310    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,04,2010 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. We ask that any plan that is approved will do the following:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families 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. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

**Correspondence ID:** 3311    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,04,2010 20:34:47  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please protect Cape Hatteras from Off Road Vehicles (ORV).  
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. We all deserve equal access and a safe space on a national park.  
I personally would not hike on a beach with my small children if there were vehicles permitted to drive there.  
Thank you for your consideration.  
Sincerely,  
Kate O'Brien

**Correspondence ID:** 3312    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Richards, Diana  
**Received:** May,04,2010 20:35:40  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Allowing ORVs on the shoreline ruins an otherwise unique habitat for wildlife and people who love the natural world. Please preserve the integrity, health, and beauty of our coastline for all of us by prohibiting the intrusion of motor vehicles.

**Correspondence ID:** 3313    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Lorch, Frank  
**Received:** May,04,2010 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 ask that any plan that is approved do the following: 1) Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families 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. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. 2) Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

**Correspondence ID:** 3314    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,04,2010 20:42:55  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please vote to keep all vehicles off the beach at Cape Hatteras National Seashore and all beaches. Vehicles destroy turtle nests, bird nests and beach grasses that help prevent erosion. They compact the sand where crustaceans, molluscs and other invertebrates burrow. These invertebrates are at the bottom of the food chain for fish, birds and mammals on the beaches and in the coastal waters. A few hours of "fun" for humans should not be allowed to destroy habitat for the animals who live on the beaches.

**Correspondence ID:** 3315    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Francis, Andriulinas  
**Received:** May,04,2010 20:48:13  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I don't agree with adding more restrictions to the use of ORVs on the Cape Hatteras Seashore. Although I have seldom had the opportunity to ride the seashore in a vehicle I cherish the experience, more so my young daughters had the opportunity and believe that had a great impact on the concerns they have for the environment. As a property owner on the Outer Banks and a visitor to the area for over 30 years I can say that a happy balance between vehicles and nature can be reached. I think some times in this country we make too many rules to follow, so many that we fail to recognize the ones we have. I think we need more rules to tell us what we can do and less to tell us what we can't. It is true that no matter what we do as a society, we will have those that abuse the rules, and to that I say they must face the penalty. I have a tremendous respect for the environment, as well as those who wish to enjoy it. 95 percent of the people respect and take care of the environment, we need to deal with the 5 percent that don't. In the times that we live in we need to encourage people to get out and be a part of the environment, limiting ORV use could endanger the experience of a whole generation. Many years ago on Onslow beach I spent the night riding the beach with a ranger and tagging sea turtles, marking and protecting the nests. I'll never forget that experience, it gave me a true sense of how important it is to protect those animals that can't make it alone. Education and enforcement is key, restricting ORVs on the beach may very well result in less interest in the preservation of endangered animals as less people will have the ability to understand and experience them. I think we are advanced enough to figure out how to accomplish protecting the environment while enjoying the environment to it's fullest extent. Thank You.

**Correspondence ID:** 3316    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,04,2010 20:55:00  
**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:** 3317    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Ritt, Clifford W  
**Received:** May,04,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am an Outer Banks resident. I support limits on beach driving, specifically Option E listed in the draft statement.

Please act to protect our beaches from large numbers of automobiles that threaten endangered species and intrude on the public's enjoyment of our natural areas.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3318    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Fitzgerald, Thomas L  
**Received:** May,04,2010 21:15:21  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** The National Park Service's stated purpose of a the Cape Hatteras National Seashore (CHNS) is to preserve and interpret, while providing for the public use and enjoyment of these resources, ensuring they are maintained for future generations to enjoy. CHNS and under federal jurisdiction are an outstanding example of unspoiled coastal resources which are readily accessible to the general public. This access which goes back in time to our original settlers includes a colorful history of natural and cultural events and uses that compliment the ephemeral and every changing barrier island environment. The native islanders of this area appreciate this history and have relied upon this unfettered access to build many family businesses in the area's small communities centered on the relaxing benefit of easy access to unspoiled, uncrowded beaches, and some of the best surf fishing and wave sports along the East Coast. It is vital that this management plan address the impact to these local stewards in a forthright and open manner during the Environmental Impact Analysis process. It is not acceptable to discount these impacts as insignificant or minor, the impacts need to be quantified as a large portion of these businesses operate on very small margins and although the cumulative dollar impact may be negligible in comparison to the budgets of large commercial enterprises the impact to small business owners and sole proprietorships can be dramatic and need to be adequately assessed as part of management plan impacts. This should include a specific study of all existing business licensees operating within 10 miles of the CHNS boundary. Central to the Park Service's preferred access management plan (Alternative F) are elements to significantly restrict access to the seashore to protect nesting bird and turtles. With 20% of the overall land area already dedicated to this purpose (Pea Island) it would seem that relocation of turtle nests is a more pragmatic (and academically defensible) manner of encouraging the recovery of these species. This would reduce the number and extent of preservation area exclusion zones and should be considered as a part of the recommended management strategy. Nesting bird areas are more difficult to management given the variability in nesting habits and land based rearing practices. Based on my 40 years of coastal boating experience up and down the Atlantic seaboard, it is clearly evident that small, predator free islands are prime "natural" nesting sites for a variety of these threatened and endangered species. As such priority should be given to creating suitable habitat on existing dredge spoil islands around the CHNS and including them in the management provisions to reduce human impacts to these bird populations (i.e. place seasonal restrictions on access to these islands). The NPS should also work with ACOE and NCWRC to create more of these islands to improve nesting sites for both turtle and bird populations. This would limit the need to provide such extensive buffer areas proposed for the beach areas, smaller areas would be appropriate for nesting birds, fledglings could migrate to adjacent "protected" islands to improve their chances of reaching adulthood as they would then be in a predator free environment. Closing off large sections of the beaches during prime fishing and surf seasons is not consistent with the mission of the Park Service in managing these resources for all intended and historic uses. These closures are seen as arbitrary and subject to the quality of judgments exercised by often inexperienced unprofessional field agents. Provision of mandatory access corridors around these exclusion areas should be a requirement of the management plan to preserve full access to the beach resources to the maximum extent practical. Without access there is no resource. It is too easy under the current rules for arbitrary closure of an area without documentation of need, closures need to be documented in an on-line format using time dated digital photography, updated at least bi-weekly to highlight the resource being protected and to encourage public education on the management of these resources. This process should be outlined in the impact statement both as a preferred management procedure and a mitigation measure during closure events. This would help promote the cause of wildlife protection while simultaneously providing open documentation of the viability of the access management control. Field management staff should be required to attend a local chamber of commerce forum, meeting of the angler's association, surf rider's foundation and local outdoor motor sports organization meeting to gain an understanding of the historic uses of this area so these uses are preserved for future generations. This should be a part of introductory training to the area. A management commission composed of members of these bodies should be available to assist NPS staff with addressing access concerns, and dealing with aberrant/abusive behavior in a cooperative, non-authoritative manner consistent with promoting the seashore experience as a fun, relaxing vacation destination consistent with its historic uses and future stewardship.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3319    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,04,2010 21:25:00  
**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:** 3320    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Kalet, Richard M  
**Received:** May,04,2010 21:40:24  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** "I am a resident of North Carolina who enjoys recreational opportunities offered by the Cape Hatteras National Seashore and Recreational Area. Reasonable and safe pedestrian and vehicular access to the beach is essential to participate and enjoy these resources and opportunities. I also support

0009706

restrictions and conditions necessary to protect the birds, sea turtles, and other biota that are supported by scientific data and can make the Seashore home for part of the year. I believe the favor alternative (#7) advanced by the NPS is more restrictive than necessary to meet protection of the Seashore. I have read and agree with the proposal to manage ORV's on the Seashore prepared and submitted for consideration by the Coalition for Beach Access. My position is that the NPS accept this alternative or at least postpone a final decision on the ORV Plan pending further review and negotiation on the counter points raised by the Coalition for Beach Access

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3321    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Vanderford, Brian W  
**Received:** May,04,2010 21:41:11  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Greetings from Salisbury, I am for an ORV plan that allows open access to our natural resources. We need a plan that protects wildlife. However, we do not need to punish law abiding citizens who love wildlife and the right to enjoy our beaches. I have been coming to the outer banks for over 10 years. I remember the sunsets at the point with my 4yr old, fishing and shelling and finding a starfish. That was a memorable time. For the past few years we were not even allowed to be on the point even after nest were washed away. Not by us but by nature. These birds like being around people. We have coexisted for years with no problems. I was able to see 7 piping plover at one time while fishing in an open section of beach. They were constantly coming around me. People being on the beach keeps them from nesting below the storm wash and water lines. It is a shame that we don't give God's creation a little bit of credit. They know where to nest and they know where people are. You may ask if I know what a piping plover is? Yes! I do, because after a discussion with a NPS worker the area I fished was closed a week later. We cannot play God! Animals, Birds and People die everyday. It is my position that a workable plan can be in place but the people who have lived and made their lives on these pristine beaches must be given the right and have the final say. They have lost tourism and their rights to activist who have manipulated the system. They (activist) do not care about our economy nor do they care about our freedoms. If you have not noticed that it is almost impossible for a recreational fisherman to walk with a family of four through waves several hundred yards to reach fishing spots that are world renown, they will not come back. It seems every year that these traditional fishing spots are always closed to ORV traffic. Let's be honest with ourselves, I do not think that piping plover, Oyster catchers, and the sea turtles have it out for recreational fishermen. For we are the ones who feed fish scraps to their young and report nest sightings. I support the coalition for beach access position on DEIS. If you look at the matter of killing animals to protect others as one NPS worker shared with me, our society is messed up. Federally protected animals (otters) should not be killed to protect birds, PERIOD!!!! We are not playing God here! Animals survive and those that do not, don't. I have watched PBS nature broadcast programs where some animals survive and some do not. If we are truly concerned about wildlife then let wildlife take care of itself. We are guardians of what the good Lord has given to us, but we are not in the position to take care of every species of bird and animal alike. That is the Maker's job. So let us remember that he is in control. Give us the freedom that God has given to us and we will do a good job of taking care of His gift to us in the Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Thanks Brian Vanderford

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3322    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,04,2010 21:54:59  
**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:** 3323    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Payne, Stanley C  
**Received:** May,04,2010 21:59:41  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As a life line resident, so many times it seems people who do not live here, claiming to be an environmentalist, have rallied to control our land, animals, birds and fish based on false information. Some of the people I have met are basing their opinions on erroneous information, some on their ability to gain recognition, and some who believe what they are saying without investigation into the true facts. As natives and/or current residents we believe all of our visitors also have a right to express their opinion, but it should be an informed one.  
There is room to open a corridor for people to use without endangering the wildlife if properly monitored. Before shutting down our beaches, utilize and continue to monitor growth or decline using a small access corridor without completely closing down access. Wildlife is important and a part of what makes our area special, but so are people. There is room to share the land.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3324    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,04,2010 22:09:11  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Mr. Murray,  
I do not agree the NPS on whether or not there is significant data for TCP or historic/traditional cultural properties.  
In the NC Museum of History - North Carolina American Indian History Timeline from 700 A.D. to 1550 A.D. "Many groups of American Indians live in the area now known as North Carolina. These include the Chowanoke, Croatan, Hatteras, Moratoc, Secotan, Weapemeoc, Machapunga, Pamlico, Coree, Neuse River, Tuscarora, Meherrin, Cherokee, Cape Fear, Catawba, Shakori, Sissipahaw, Sugeree, Waccamaw, Waxhaw, Woccon, Cheraw, Eno, Keyauwee, Occaneechi, Saponi, and Tutelo Indians." From the tribal names alone, one clearly sees how our towns earned their names and the fruit we grow came to their names.

In the Genealogy North Carolina Indian Tribes web site many of the above Tribal Nations are defined as to where they lived, what tribes they were integrated with,(Connections). Where they were located, their history, the significance of their names and what became of their population.

I take to inform you, from the web site above, the following:

HATTERAS. Meaning unknown, linguistic Connections.-The HATTERAS belonged to the Algonquian linguistic family. Location. Among the sandbanks about Cape Hatteras east of Pamlico Sound and frequenting Roanoke Island. Village Sandbanks, on Hatteras Island. History. Lawson (1860) thought the Hatteras showed traces of White blood and therefore they may have been the CROATAN INDIANS with whom Raleigh's colonists are supposed to have taken refuge. They dissappeared soon after as a distinct tribe and united with the mainland Algonquians. In 1761, the Rev. Alex Stewart baptized 7 Indians and mixed-blood children of the "Attamuskeet, Hatteras and Roanoke" tribes and 2 years later he baptized 21 more.

Population. The Hatteras population has been estimated with the Machapunga and other tribes at 1,200 in 1600; they had 16 warriors in 1701, or a total population of about 80. Connection in which they have become noted. The possible connection of the Hatteras with the Croatan have been mentioned and their name has become perpetuated in the dangerous cape at the angle of the outer sand islands of their old country.

Superintendent Mr. Murray, kindly think about the above and think about the folks who have been here for generations and very possibly have Native American in their bloodlines. The Native Americans were the first people here, long before Audobon Society and Defenders of Wildlife.

I have no claim to American Native heritage or their bloodlines, but they are part of our history and very much a part of everyone's culture as an American.

Respectfully submitted,

Ali Kerekes - Kill Devil Hills, NC

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3325    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Hay, Sam  
**Received:** May,04,2010 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 strongly oppose ORV use in any part of the National Seashore other than parking lots.  
We ask that any plan that is approved will do the following:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families 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. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.?

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3326    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,04,2010 22:25:56  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I find it ridiculous that only 16 of the 64 miles of beach would be prohibited from Off Road Vehicle use. Instead, a full 32 miles should be prohibited, while I myself would prefer a minimum of 45 prohibited miles.  
Further, preservation and protection of the natural resources found on this gem of our state should be the deciding factor in all deliberations concerning it... (Let these off road eejits drive down to Florida if they desire to ruin a beach!)  
The entire focus of any regulations concerning this once pristine portion of our coast should be maintainance and furthering of the biodiversity found there throughout the year. Please strive to protect the wildlife found in North Carolina, and that includes the proper vetting of said wildlife!  
Good luck,  
Christopher B. Loftis USN,Ret, DAV

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3327    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,04,2010 22:55:06  
**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.

---

0009708

**Correspondence ID:** 3328    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** walker, jeff a  
**Received:** May,04,2010 23:05:54  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please help us keep our access to the outer banks and parks and keep "special interest groups" from dictating what happens on the areas we love and enjoy. We, the sportsmen and outdoor enthusiast love our time we get to spend in these areas, we have been enjoying them for generations and want our children to experience what we have. I feel that we care far more about our resources and respect the creatures that live in these areas far more than is acknowledged. The economic impact has hit these areas hard. To wrap it up, I know my friends and everyone I've met while I spent time in these areas leave them better than they find them, and help new comers learn how to enjoy and respect nature and some of the greatest places that we have here in our state and country. thanks, J Walker

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3329    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,04,2010 23:23:11  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am in favor of the continued use of Off Road vehicles on the Hatteras beaches. It's our state and as a resident, I wish to enjoy the freedom of enjoying this natural wonder, and enlightening our children to the 'Special Nature' of this piece of Earth and its preservation as a such. 5/4/2010

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3330    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Baine, Robert B  
**Received:** May,04,2010 23:24:32  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I don't understand the need for a group of "beltway bandits" to make decisions regarding our beaches. Especially since the land was originally given to the NPS as a recreational facility, not a game preserve as a special interest group like the Audubon Society would have it. A question becomes apparent when we have to respond by 11:59PM "Mountain Time". How can anyone who has never visited the island be making decisions from "mountain time"? I am not a native of the island, but started vacationing in 1961 with my new family. My children and theirs have enjoyed riding in a 4 wheel vehicle to the Point and collecting shells. Now, so much of the Island has been cordoned off because of a few birds (that are not even indigenous to Hatteras) that you can't drive from Buxton to Frisco on the beach anymore. Is it any wonder that both visitors and natives despise the NPS and their arrogant manner? We are treated as though we were the most "backward folk". No self-respecting islander is going to run over turtle eggs or deliberately crush a bird's nest. You people close a thousand yards of beach when 50 yards would suffice. The last time I read the Constitution, there was no mention of the NPS. Please leave us alone and get off our island. Yes, I own property on Hatteras. But it was because of the beauty of the sand and sea, AND the freedom to roam the beaches that I bought it. It is time that your socialist agenda is stopped and people take the island out of your hands, and put it back under the control of the State of North Carolina. You have brought shame on yourselves.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3331    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,04,2010 23:55:27  
**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:** 3332    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Laughridge, Charles H  
**Received:** May,05,2010 04:14:39  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose the implementation of Plan F for Cape Hatteras Nat. Seashore. It hasn't shown any real help for the bird life on the beaches and has kept the public from using one of our national treasures.  
Good day

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3333    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,05,2010 04:17:09  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** "I am a resident of North Carolina who enjoys recreational opportunities offered by the Cape Hatteras National Seashore and Recreational Area. Reasonable and safe pedestrian and vehicular access to the beach is essential to participate and enjoy these resources and opportunities. I also support restrictions and conditions necessary to protect the birds, sea turtles, and other biota that are supported by scientific data and can make the Seashore home for part of the year. I believe the favor alternative (#7) advanced by the NPS is more restrictive than necessary to meet protection of the Seashore. I have read and agree with the proposal to manage ORV's on the Seashore prepared and submitted for consideration by the Coalition for Beach Access. My position is that the NPS accept this alternative or at least postpone a final decision on the ORV Plan pending further review and negotiation on the counter points raised by the Coalition for Beach Access."

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3334	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May.05.2010 04:47:57						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Other an an emergency vehicle in an emergency, there should be absolutely no driving at all on beaches. If I wanted to listen to gasoline engines, I'd stand beside Interstate 40. Vehicles on the beach take away the very essence of the beach experience for those of us who travel there or choose to live there. They intrude, they destroy. Please keep them off. Let me hear the sounds of nature, walk along a shore without tiretracks. PLEASE.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3335	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May.05.2010 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	It is terribly disturbing to see how many of our natural areas are being compromised by the intusion of humanity. Please, let us give a priority to keeping our environment as natural as possible. I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the 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 ask that any plan that is approved will do the following: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families 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. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.?						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3336	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May.05.2010 05:01:31						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please do not close the beaches on Hatteras Island. It is going to seriously hurt our economy and ultimately destroy families. While being environmentally aware it is not necessary to hurt humans.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3337	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	Piendel, David B						
<b>Received:</b>	May.05.2010 05:11:17						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Regarding the Cape Hatteras Nat'l Seashore, the citizens of our country and the world expect you to protect the land. Please reject short term thinking for a long term perspective. Allowing DEIS to grant the defiling of nature's gift is a sin. David Piendel						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3338	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	Allen, Keith R						
<b>Received:</b>	May.05.2010 05:15:06						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	When I go to the beach, I don't go there to breathe the exhaust of vehicles designed to drive on public roadways, or the exhaust of "off-road vehicles." Neither of these is appropriate for driving/parking on public beaches. They also degrade plant and animal habitat in beach areas. If you want to provide access to public beaches for handicapped individuals, there are less destructive ways of doing this than turning our beaches in public thoroughfares or parking lots.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3339	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May.05.2010 05:23:46						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	recreational opportunities offered by the Cape Hatteras National Seashore and Recreational Area. Reasonable and safe pedestrian and vehicular access to the beach is essential to participate and enjoy these resources and opportunities. I also support restrictions and conditions necessary to protect the birds, sea turtles, and other biota that are supported by scientific data and can make the Seashore home for part of the year. I believe the favor alternative (#7) advanced by the NPS is more restrictive than necessary to meet protection of the Seashore. I have read and agree with the proposal to manage ORV's on the Seashore prepared and submitted for consideration by the Coalition for Beach Access. My position is that the NPS accept this alternative or at least postpone a final decision on the ORV Plan pending further review and negotiation on the counter points raised by the Coalition for Beach Access." Sincerely, paul brown						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3340	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	Fediaczko, Gordon						
<b>Received:</b>	May.05.2010 05:24:29						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Where has common sense gone? When did the Piping Plover made it to the top of the food chain? I have watched the environmental organizations inch by inch then acre by acre then mile by mile encroach upon the freedoms bestowed upon the citizens of this great country. These organizations along with others in this country have placed the value of wildlife out of proportion to their value at the expense of my children and my grand children, by the way are taught to be good stewards of our environment. For example, the proposed bridge, some 17 years ago, to replace the Bonner bridge has been delayed because of inane environmentalist actions. What economic impact has this wrought? The increase in the cost of construction is astronomical. Out west, farmers are denied water which impacts their livelihood because it is BELIEVED that a small fish is endangered. I do not believe the proposal to protect the Piping Plover and the nesting turtles has given responsible consideration to the economic devastation to Dare						

County by an action such as this.

I stongle suggest a decision to delay implementing this action be made until a full analysis be made regarding the effect this will have on the citizens and home owners of Dare County especial those who live on the Cape.  
Rethink what you are doing. Use common sense.

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3341	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	
<b>Name:</b>	oppenheim, ken r					
<b>Received:</b>	May,05,2010 00:00:00					
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>As a wildlife biologist, I have traveled that area for 40 years. Your problem is mostly predators--not taxpayers. This seems to me as more government control of our lives.</p> <p>"I am a resident of North Carolina who enjoys recreational opportunities offered by the Cape Hatteras National Seashore and Recreational Area. Reasonable and safe pedestrian and vehicular access to the beach is essential to participate and enjoy these resources and opportunities. I also support restrictions and conditions necessary to protect the birds, sea turtles, and other biota that are supported by scientific data and can make the Seashore home for part of the year. I believe the favor alternative (#7) advanced by the NPS is more restrictive than necessary to meet protection of the Seashore. I have read and agree with the proposal to manage ORV's on the Seashore prepared and submitted for consideration by the Coalition for Beach Access. My position is that the NPS accept this alternative or at least postpone a final decision on the ORV Plan pending further review and negotiation on the counter points raised by the Coalition for Beach Access."</p>					
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3342	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	
<b>Name:</b>	Babics, William					
<b>Received:</b>	May,05,2010 05:52:47					
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>p 97-101 I disagree Fishing Rights and plover rights could be insured by yellow taping paths to the fishing grounds at ramps 23 and 27. Preventing sunrise fishing stops one from the best fishing times.</p> <p>People access should be allowed to all beaches. Public awareness can be enhanced by posting objectives. I personally haven't seen anyone violate the restriction tapes around the turtle nesting and the plover areas</p>					
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3343	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	
<b>Name:</b>	LANE, LINDA S					
<b>Received:</b>	May,05,2010 00:00:00					
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>I HAVE READ AND AGREE WITH THE FOLLOWING COMMENTS AS A RESIDENT OF NC: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the 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 ask that any plan that is approved will do the following:</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>Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best 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>					
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3344	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b> Y
<b>Name:</b>	private					
<b>Received:</b>	May,05,2010 06:11:28					
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>Have you been to an unspoiled beach lately? If not, why not? Being at a beautiful place on the beach is one of the most inspiring, relaxing, spiritual experiences we can have on this planet. Have you been to a beach where driving is allowed? If you have, you know how much that disturbs the peace and natural beauty of the setting.</p> <p>I visit the beach often for relaxation and rest, and I have been learning about beach ecology through the environmental education workshops and field study I have been involved in. More and more I am learning how fragile the shore environment is, and if we want to keep its natural beauty intact, we must take care of it. Before coming to North Carolina, I never knew that places actually ALLOWED vehicles to drive on the beach! I was appalled. Even many years ago, before learning about the negative impact that has on wildlife, I knew it was a bad idea.</p> <p>Have you ever been on a beach and had your blanket run over by an ATV or SUV? I have. Have YOU ever almost been run over by same vehicles? I have. Do you know how many shore birds actually NEST right in the sand, and how easily they are disturbed, and will abandon a nest if disturbed? Do you know the vast numbers of migrating birds that spend time on our beaches?</p> <p>People fished along these shores for many years without gas powered vehicles motoring up and down the beaches. It is a bad idea whose time has come to end. Letting people get into big cars and drive them around on our beaches, destroying wildlife important to the ecology of the beach is a bad idea. We need to do what we can to curb or eliminate it.</p> <p>Of course, ORV users will complain loudly. So will an obese child when put on a diet. But for our coastlines to be healthy, we must do something NOW.</p>					
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3345	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b> Y
<b>Name:</b>	private					
<b>Received:</b>	May,05,2010 06:12:48					
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>We want you to support House Bill HR 6233 and Senate Bill S.3113 to reinstate the Interim Management Strategy and keep the Beach access open. The Barrier Island _BEACHES are the largest part of the lives of the community and Business world.</p> <p>Small operators who make up all of the business community do not have the luxury of any other source of income without tourism. Slowly, businesses as the Charter fishing, restaurants, rental houses for tourists are recovering from the financial crisis, recession.</p> <p>DO NOT CLOSE THE BEACHES.</p>					

The economy will dry up, property values will drastically drop because tourism will diminish due to no access to the beaches.

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3346	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May.05.2010 06:13:06						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I am a resident of North Carolina who enjoys recreational opportunities offered by the Cape Hatteras National Seashore and Recreational Area. Reasonable and safe pedestrian and vehicular access to the beach is essential to participate and enjoy these resources and opportunities. I also support restrictions and conditions necessary to protect the birds, sea turtles, and other biota that are supported by scientific data and can make the Seashore home for part of the year. I believe the favor alternative (#7) advanced by the NPS is more restrictive than necessary to meet protection of the Seashore. I have read and agree with the proposal to manage ORV's on the Seashore prepared and submitted for consideration by the Coalition for Beach Access. My position is that the NPS accept this alternative or at least postpone a final decision on the ORV Plan pending further review and negotiation on the counter points raised by the Coalition for Beach Access.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3347	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	
<b>Name:</b>	Johnson, Alan R						
<b>Received:</b>	May.05.2010 06:21:15						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I am in support of stopping vehicle access to critical beach areas that are important for shore nesting birds. I am also in favor of increasing the time they are off limits to encourage the breeding birds success. These areas and the birds they support are important to all citizens and should not be degraded by the few that use them for recreational purposes. Alan Johnson						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3348	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May.05.2010 06:28:45						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Let's protect our shoreline and beaches.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3349	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	
<b>Name:</b>	Metzgar, Michael						
<b>Received:</b>	May.05.2010 06:33:14						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please read this thoroughly.....Your decision to keep or destroy this submission will impact millions of Americans now and in the future. It is unbelievable to me that Americans with long standing traditions of using the Capes and Spits of Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area are on the verge of losing that part of their culture. These long standing families and succeeding generations have earned their livelihood from access to the ocean. As we have already seen, although 'not observed' by the Interior Department or NPS officials, the local residents are being adversely affected by the impacts of beach closures. It is incomprehensible to me that protected but not endangered birds are at the center of this controversy and closures. Furthermore the amount of money that has been spent to evaluate the options (Reg-Neg), develop the plan (DEIS) and all the other plans and implementation yet to come could have been used to further the proliferation of the protected species in so many ways..... Turtle nest have been relocated in other National Seashores and other locations in this country for years with fantastic success. Why does NPS at Cape Hatteras resist doing this if saving the species is truly the reason? Is this some kind of a devious plan to close the Park to everyone? With the known voracity of storms here is it NPS at Cape Hatteras' intent to have the nests be lost and the turtle eggs drown rather than propagate the species? Judge Boyle at the behest of the Southern Environmental Law Center and the Audubon Society etal has established cordoned areas around turtle and non-endangered nests that are only surpassed by the security provided for the President of the United States. There is no sound science for the closures surrounding these birds and turtles nests. In Rhode Island the US Fish and Wildlife Service allows ORV's to pass within 50 feet of a Piping Plover or other non-endangered bird. On Cape Hatteras they want the entire Park for as a bird Sanctuary and Audubon and others agree. In Florida people are allowed to sunbathe within 5 feet of a turtle nest.....and by the way the turtles survive at a much better rate than at Cape Hatteras. WHY? Because they are protected BY man not protected FROM man. The inconsistencies in the science of the protection birds and turtles need FROM man are ludicrous. The fact that the non-endangered birds need an area the size of an aircraft carrier in which to reproduce and raise their young is poppycock. For many years and on many occasions Piping Plovers and other birds have nested and fledged along the only access in and out of the Seashore; Route 12. Recently a rookery was established on the top of Connors store in Buxton. Is NPS and Interior really trying to propagate the species or close the Park to its owners.....the American Public? I wonder why we don't cordon off a similar size area around the Lincoln Memorial or the Washington Monument when a threatened bird builds a nest near them. Certainly they have! The public outcry would be an embarrassment to NPS and Interior. The political pressure would cause them to relent....move the nest.....and reopen the attraction. Certainly these or other non-endangered birds build nests on or near other Washington, DC buildings. Why don't the closures affect these cities and monuments? My family and I have visited and toured over 100 National Parks and Monuments and have never encountered what is happening at Cape Hatteras. Why is this only happening on Seashores? If Alternative F is adopted.....CHNSRA will become the next tourist attraction for those that visit the Ghost Towns of the Old West. This will happen on OBX if the beaches are closed. It will look much like the bygone communities of the Old West when the silver or gold ran out. In modern times we see the depressed areas of Central Pennsylvania where the two main industries, steel and coal were king. We see Detroit where the auto industry was king.....now in the process of closing 1/2 of their schools, having government buying entire city blocks and bulldozing the remaining structure and removing them. This will be the future of the seven villages within the Park if Alternative F is adopted. Another economy will be murdered by many who have never walked on these beaches or taken the time to understand the economic impact on 7 small communities with 2 industries: Tourism and Fishing.....all in the name of Species Conservation. There has to be a balance between man and beast.....It has been that way since the days of Adam and Eve! Mike Metzgar Roaring Spring, PA						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3350	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	
<b>Name:</b>	Mackie, Margaret ANNE W						
<b>Received:</b>	May.05.2010 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. We ask that any plan that is approved will do the following: 1) At least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. 2) Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The						

preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3351    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,05,2010 06:42:14  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** If people feel the need to drive on beaches instead of walking, they've lost touch with what these areas are all about. Keep these beaches safe for wildlife and serene for walkers!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3352    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,05,2010 06:52:55  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** This is such a beautiful precious natural resource that should be open to all people without disturbing that which makes this place special and without disturbing other people who visit.  
I have seen ORVs controlling the beach, leaving no opportunity for others to enjoy the beauty and tranquility. Shouldn't families with just beach towels have as many rights as people with ORVs, perhaps even more because they do not harm the environment?

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3353    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,05,2010 07:06:12  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I have lived in North Carolina for most of my life, I now live in Virginia. I have been going fishing on the outer banks for 30 plus years, my fishing buddies and myself take care of the Banks. We pick up trash, don't harm the dunes act responsibly. We and others want to continue this process. We contribute much to the local economy. We buy fishings equipment supplies and eat out. Larry Gregory

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3354    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Markey, Carol  
**Received:** May,05,2010 07:13:09  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I have visited the beaches of North Carolina since I was a child, and back then, only fishermen, for a very limited fall fishing season, were allowed to bring vehicles to the beach. The destruction of non-fishermen is ridiculous! Have you witnessed this first hand? My family spent its LAST vacation at Cape Hatteras last year, because we were disgusted by the vehicle activity, fearful of stupid and drunk drivers who wanted to do wheelies in the sand, horrified by the fumes and the effort required to 'dig out' when they became stuck in the sand, and in awe of a National Park that would even allow such destruction! DO NOT EXTEND BUT PLEASE DISCONTINUE THIS PRACTICE OF ALLOWING VEHICLES ON THE BEACHES OF NORTH CAROLINA!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3355    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,05,2010 07:16:48  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I read the Off-Road Vehicle Management Plan/EIS, went to the open hearing in Ocracoke and was puzzled. The complaining legal firm representative at the meeting I went to in Ocracoke stood up and said, "the bird population is down 87 percent and off road vehicle use is up! We have to do something". (Implying coincidence was causality.) What he did not say was, "we need to do something that addresses whatever it is that is causing the decline in bird population." The EIS premise, that off road vehicle use at the park is a significant, or even meaningful, factor in the decline of birds, has no evidence to back up that claim. Indeed, there is freely available, convincing evidence that a complete ban of all vehicles would have no effect on the bird population. On the south side of Ocracoke inlet is the abandoned town of Portsmouth and miles of beach to the south. It has the same weather, sand, water, vegetation and topography as Ocracoke and the rest of the barrier island land to the north. It also has virtually no off-road vehicles. The bird population here is NO DIFFERENT in density than that of Ocracoke and the land north of it, yet the EIS proposes the virtual banning of off road vehicles from near the water and building a parking lot in the bird breeding area as a solution to the decline of birds! To produce a "plan" that will have no positive effect on the stated desired outcome of the exercise calls into question the competence and/or integrity of those that produced it. To approve a plan that needlessly has a profound negative impact on those that live in the area and those who visit the park from across the country would be a disservice to those the park was meant to serve. I know a judge requires you to produce a plan. Provide a plan that minimizes restrictions on park access with sensible, minimal standoffs from breeding areas.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3356    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,05,2010 07:25:56  
**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:** 3357    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** V , Mike  
**Received:** May.05.2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. I ask that ANY plan that is approved will do the following:  
 Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families 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. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
 Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.?

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3358    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.05.2010 07:41:31  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Department of Interior NPS:  
 I am PRO ACCESS  
 I have been coming to the outerbanks since I was 5 years old in 1983. I love it and it provides me great joy and happiness. Over the last 3 years I have been miserable because of the beach closures. You have stolen my constitutional right for life liberty and pursuit of happiness because you failed the American People by not doing as you were required in the 1970's. A ORV management plan was sent to you in Washington and you failed to finalize it leaving the door open for the environmentalist to turn a national park and RECREATIONAL SEASHORE into a wild life refuge. YOU Have failed the people who fund your government sector.  
 ORV access on the OBX provide me with family and friend fellowship as well as giving my father who can not walk great distances due to knee injuries access to beach fishing.  
 If the closures continue to grow and you continue to rob us of our constitutional rights, you will kill the Dare, Hyde, and Terrell county economy. You can protect the birds in a responsible manor and not as cowards that lay down for the environmentalist groups to walk all over us.  
 Concerned Citizen that is losing my constitutional rights.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3359    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.05.2010 07:54:28  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** My husband and I are opposed to allowing off-road vehicles, or any vehicles, on the beaches of the Outer Banks, and especially the Cape Hatteras National Seashore. We take our family there to vacation each summer, and do not want to see the natural beauty ruined by air-stinking, beach-eroding vehicles driven by people who care little, if at all, about the sea creatures who live on the shore, or the other vacationers who are trying to enjoy it. Please curtail the use of off-road vehicles severely, or better yet, do not allow them at all. They will ruin something that cannot be replaced. Sincerely,  
 Diane and Robby Clark

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3360    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.05.2010 07:55:58  
**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.

0009714

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3361    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.05.2010 07:56:03  
**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:** 3362    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.05.2010 07:56:03  
**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:** 3363    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** warner, dennis m  
**Received:** May.05.2010 07:59:54  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** When the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area was established the people of the villages was promised by the Park Service and the Department of Interior that they would always and forever have access to the seashore to carry out their culture and way of life. The DEIS does not live up to this promise. And with the economy the way it is the DEIS will shut down these villages. People including myself will discontinue to go there because they will not be able to access the areas were they want to recreate. The Interim Plan that was in effect before the Consent Decree went above and beyond the protection needed for the birds and turtles. And now two years into the Consent Decree the Park Service wants to restrict access even more with the DEIS. Why ? There is no more birds or turtles now then there was 3 years ago. Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area is not an ideal place for either one. Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area is on the most southern tip of the Piping Plovers migrating area and the northern tip for the turtles. These animals never did well here and never will. So why ruin peoples lives for a handfull of birds or turtles ? Restricting access the way the DEIS lays out will do nothing but undo harm to the people that love and cherish the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area. The real stewards of the seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3364    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.05.2010 08:01:37  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** In your efforts to save the bird populations, which appear to be increasing on their own, please keep in mind the national parks were created for humans to enjoy the natural features they offer. The parks, seashores and other protected areas were not created with the intent to keep humans out.  
Respectfully,  
-James Canniff

**Correspondence ID:** 3365    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Upton, James D  
**Received:** May,05,2010 08:12:27  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I disagree with the following part of DEIS  
Pg 136

Implementation of a permit system with an educational component, larger buffer sizes, seasonal nightdriving restrictions, PROHIBITION OF PETS IN THE SEASHORE DURING THE BREEDING SEASON IN CLUDING IN FRONT OF THE VILLAGES, and establishment of breeding and nonbreeding SMAs would benefit the American oystercatcher. SMAs would provide a proactive method of limiting recreational uses early in the breeding season, and limit the potential for impacts to statelisted/special status species.  
American Oystercatchers (*Haematopus palliatus*) are striking black and white shorebirds with large reddish-orange bills. Oystercatchers breed on coastal beaches from Baja California to Nova Scotia (Nol and Humphrey 1994). Recent evidence of population declines, particularly in the Southeastern U.S. (Davis et al 2001), has prompted research aimed at understanding the bird's biology and conservation needs. American Oystercatchers are listed as threatened in Georgia and Florida, and proposed as a "species of special concern" in North Carolina.  
<http://www.ncsu.edu/project/grsmgis/AMOY/Research.htm>  
The prohibition of dogs would not only cause a hardship on pet owners would have a direct economic impact on the bussiness of the Island. I currently bring my dog when I come to the seashore. If I had to board my dog for the time I am there I could not afford to come. I AM CURRENTLY LEASING A SPACE IN ONE OF THE LOCAL CAMPGROUNDS AT A COST OF \$3100.00 PER YEAR. If I can not bring my pet I will not renew my lease in the future. The amount I spend each trip will no longer available to the local merchants to add to their economy. I urge the NPS to take another look at this proposal. As you see above the American Oystercatcher is only listed as a "species of special concern" in North Carolina. As such the NPS is going beyond its intended scope in closing the use of MY CAPE HATTERAS NATIONAL SEASHORE RECDREATIONAL AREA TO PET OWNERS.

**Correspondence ID:** 3366    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Upton, James D  
**Received:** May,05,2010 08:26:51  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I disagree with the following statement of the DEIS  
Pg 224

The American oystercatcher is classified as a Species of High Concern in the U.S. Shorebird Conservation Plan because of its small population (11,000 individuals), widespread habitat loss, and the threats it faces both during the breeding and nonbreeding seasons (Schulte et al. 2007).  
The American Oystercatchers (*Haematopus palliatus*) are listed as a "species of special concern" in North Carolina. As the following study shows this is true. Use the best available science to backup what you say. THE NPS HAS FAILED TO DO SO IN THEIR DOCUMENT.  
American Oystercatchers (*Haematopus palliatus*) are striking black and white shorebirds with large reddish-orange bills. Oystercatchers breed on coastal beaches from Baja California to Nova Scotia (Nol and Humphrey 1994). Recent evidence of population declines, particularly in the Southeastern U.S. (Davis et al 2001), has prompted research aimed at understanding the bird's biology and conservation needs. American Oystercatchers are listed as threatened in Georgia and Florida, and proposed as a "species of special concern" in North Carolina.  
<http://www.ncsu.edu/project/grsmgis/AMOY/Research.htm>

**Correspondence ID:** 3367    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Caldwell, Gina M  
**Received:** May,05,2010 08:35:40  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** It is important to protect our beautiful beaches and the wildlife that depends on them.

**Correspondence ID:** 3368    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Crall, Mitzi  
**Received:** May,05,2010 08:44:05  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** May 5, 2010  
To Whom it May Concern:

It appears to me that restricting beach access is the quintessential solution in search of a problem. I am not aware of a single viable study that supports the claim that there is a substantial reduction in bird population due to beach traffic or that beach traffic is significantly impacting wildlife populations?much less a study that would hold up under the rigors of an unbiased peer review board. In addition, the only endangered species is the Loggerhead turtles, and there is sufficient evidence to prove that these turtles can be protected without closing off beach access.  
There is, however, ample cause to question the ultimate and underlying goals of environmental special interest groups. It is becoming ever more evident that the issues of environment have become a Holy Grail to camouflage their more insidious intent to undermine our country, our freedoms, and capitalism in general. The tactic is clever in that questioning something as sacrosanct as saving the environment leaves opponents essentially defenseless. Anyone who questions the superiority of such groups are deemed obviously uncaring, ignorant, or both. Yet, if one bothers to look at the personal lives of these self-professed environmentalists they are rife with hypocrisy and riddled with abhorrent behaviors against the very environment they profess to be protecting.  
Birds do not nest between the shoreline and the high-tide mark. How do you reconcile nest protection with eliminating driving in areas that do not contain nests? That is a pretty big stretch. Again, I suggest the motive is not based on protecting the environment, but is an assault in the ongoing class warfare that has become pervasive in our country and which is underwritten by the "environmental movement." Failure to provide passable corridors and designating excessive, unsubstantiated buffers around nesting sites is strategically and covertly closing open beach areas via lack of suitable access. I have researched and have not found a single justification for failure to provide adequate corridors to make all open areas of the beach accessible.  
While special interest groups are very effective in having public tantrums demanding that their interests be served immediately and "for the greater good," they appear much less capable of extrapolating their demands into long-term consequences. When people no longer have access to the beaches and choose to vacation elsewhere, the consequences could be more extensive than most consider. For example, the argument could be?and should be?made that it is not appropriate to continue to provide public funding to support lands that are not available to the general public for the recreational purposes they were originally set aside for. That argument is further enhanced by the government's own guidelines regarding funding and accessibility. When Federal money goes away, so do many other things, including National Park Service positions and jobs. In fact, it is feasible that the ultimate consequence is having the land revert back to private ownership, after which the wildlife will lose essentially all protections.  
If the concern was actually about wildlife, it seems to me that these groups would be front and center in assisting in the control of the feral cats on Ocracoke. I would suggest that feral cats are significantly more damaging to bird populations and wildlife in general than beach driving, but these groups have shown no concern whatsoever about mitigating this threat to our environment.  
Our system is set up to have checks and balances to avoid pandering to the interests of a few. However, as we continue to dumb down America via the public education system it is becoming ever more difficult to find people who have the necessary critical thinking skills needed to address situations like this. The fact that a breach of a protected zone was met by the knee jerk reaction of expanding the buffer zone is a case in point. Such a reaction is essentially synonymous with imposing sanctions on a foreign country to demand acquiescence. The guilty do not pay the price, only the innocent suffer. But it certainly minimizes the demands of enforcement, and failure and unwillingness to actually perform one's job conscientiously and with common

sense is another issue that is becoming dishearteningly pervasive in our country. It's much easier just to expand the buffer zone and to hell with the public ? the very people you are paid to serve.

The concern of the National Park Service was further brought into question in a recent experience we had with an injured pelican on the beach. NPS personnel found it totally appropriate to just let this poor creature suffer and starve until we pushed for action. What does that say about the National Park Service? Nothing positive. It certainly was a public relations black eye, as well as causing one to further question the underlying motives of the NPS. Could it be that the NPS's interest lies more in expanding its authority than protecting wildlife or the public's rights?

Furthermore, I question the legality of a local enforcement agency not only legislating, but legislating to override a Federal Mandate. Since there is not a single endangered bird involved, there are no laws to support the excessive actions being implemented. It would be worth investigating the possibility of abuse of power and the legal ramifications.

The environment has become such a sacred cow that no one dare question any demand to "protect it"?in spite of the fact that no one has provided anything more than anecdotal evidence that there is even a problem. The supposed facts are nothing more than assumptions. No one has validated the role that nature and storms have played in reducing wildlife populations. No one has conducted an independent study, or even established a benchmark against which information can be measured. There is a total lack of professionalism and intellectual integrity throughout this whole ordeal.

It is time someone stood up and pointed out the obvious: The Emperor has No Clothes.

Mitzi Crall, Ph.D. 35 Sand Dune Trail P.O. Box 536 Ocracoke, NC 27960 (cell) 770.310.4873

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3369	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May.05.2010 08:48:39						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Sir, Madam - I am a kitesurfer. I have visited Hatteras twice in the last year and I am (was) planning to visit Hatteras to kitesurf again later this year. I now understand there is a proposal to restrict kitesurfing/beach access in the area. This is forcing me to rethink destination as without knowing the outcome how could anyone plan a vacation. 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 USA is in an economic recession, there are many people whose livelihood depends on the tourists (largely water sport enthusiasts) to survive. Not to mention the money your organization is spending(wasting) in an attempt to evict the people who are spending money on Cape Hatteras and supporting the local economy. If it is your organizations intent to put your beliefs ahead of the well being of your citizens I will certainly be watching your future actions and I will certainly be voting in a manner to ensure your funding is cut, and your current level of support from our government is drastically reduced. 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, Peter Rastonis						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3370	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596		
<b>Name:</b>	Bowditch, Ben						
<b>Received:</b>	May.05.2010 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I am a resident of North Carolina who spends a good deal of time in and around the Cape Hatteras National Seashore and Recreational Area. I support regulations necessary to preserve the wildlife there. However, I believe that alternative (#7) advanced by the NPS is more restrictive than necessary to meet protection of the Seashore. Beach access is very important to me. I understand that there are organizations which have proposed alternatives which they believe will continue to afford access without endangering the wildlife. Please consider these alternatives before closing down the place. Thank you.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3371	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596		
<b>Name:</b>	Christie, Brandon N						
<b>Received:</b>	May.05.2010 08:54:26						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Mr. Murray, Not allowing pets in the park from March 15 to July 31 is extreme. These are the types of measurements in the Plan that are not necessary. Allowing pets in he park on leashes is reasonable and the Plan should be modified accordingly. If a pet is observed off a leash there should be a fine but disallowing pets all together is extreme. Please consider changes to this topic and other extreme measures in the Plan. The Consent Decree and other measures to close or restrict beach access is intrusive and now that it is being forced upon all of us including you we only ask that it be fair. Sincerely, Brandon Christie						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3372	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May.05.2010 08:56:05						
<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.						

0009717

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3373    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,05,2010 09:03:38  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please remove the restrictive nature of the current recommendation that severely limits "people" access in favor of a handful of birds. PEOPLE are the ones contributing to the tax base of the Cape Hatteras vicinity through millions of tourism dollars that depends greatly on our ability to utilize the natural resources under the control of the national park service. Let the taxpayers continue to enjoy these resources. Allow us the chance to continue to follow rules which protect dunes, prevent littering, and control erosion, but don't keep us and our vehicles off the beaches for the birds. Let the taxpayers fish, surf, and sail in a manner which is dependent on vehicle and foot traffic along our beaches. Please do not cave in to a minority of users who look at our resources through telescopes as opposed to the ones who immerse themselves in the beauty provided by this undeveloped public resource. If I can help expand access in any way, please let me know. Thank you,  
-Todd Blakatiis Germantown, MD (family lives in Duck, NC) 301.540.9262

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3374    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** May,05,2010 09:19:29  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I have visited several national parks in the past few years and have been most impressed by how the National Park Service protects natural areas while allowing millions of people to enjoy them. The question of off-road vehicles is one that strikes close to home. Please protect our national seashores, Cape Hatteras especially, from off-road vehicles. The noise, smell and danger of these vehicles spoils the experience of a magnificent natural area. I have vacationed on the North Carolina coast for over twenty years, and have been dismayed at the increase in jet skis - the fumes can be smelled on the beach, they are NOISY and their riders just can't seem to stay at a safe distance. Off-road vehicles just puts the same problem on the beach - closer to people trying to enjoy the beach in its natural state. I support a total ban on off-road vehicles (except emergency vehicles) on our national seashores!  
Thank you for your good work in protecting our natural treasures.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3375    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Blumenthal, Joel  
**Received:** May,05,2010 09:21:17  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am a resident of Raleigh, North Carolina who enjoys many of the recreational opportunities offered by the Cape Hatteras National Seashore and Recreational Area. Reasonable and safe pedestrian and vehicular access to the beach is essential to participate and enjoy these resources and opportunities. I also support restrictions and conditions necessary to protect the birds, sea turtles, and other biota that are supported by scientific data and can make the Seashore home for part of the year. I believe the favor alternative (#7) advanced by the NPS is more restrictive than necessary to meet protection of the Seashore. I have read and agree with the proposal to manage ORV's on the Seashore prepared and submitted for consideration by the Coalition for Beach Access. My position is that the NPS accept this alternative or at least postpone a final decision on the ORV Plan pending further review and negotiation on the counter points raised by the Coalition for Beach Access.  
Sincerely,  
Joel Blumenthal

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3376    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Weir, Dallas M  
**Received:** May,05,2010 09:23:19  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dallas M Weir Jr. 138 Mockingbird Lane Mocksville, NC 27028 May 5, 2010  
Mike Murray Superintendent Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area 1401 National Drive Manteo, NC 27954  
Dear Mr. Murray:  
The purpose of this letter is to submit my comments regarding the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area Draft Off-Road Vehicle Management Plan /Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). I request that my comments be recorded and considered in the analysis and preparation of the final NEPA and APA.  
I am a life-time resident of the Piedmont region of North Carolina and a second generation surf fisherman. My father began surf fishing on the North Carolina coast after World War II. He introduced me to surf fishing in 1955. My first visit to the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area was a vacation trip with my wife in August 1967. My first surf fishing trip to the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area was in October 1976. My most recent surf fishing trip to Ocracoke and the Cape Hatteras Point was in November 2009. Surf fishing is important to me, as it is my only recreational hobby. One of my sons now surf fishes with me. I have a two-year old grandson that I want to be able to teach surf fishing skills at Cape Hatteras someday. He will hopefully become the fourth generation of surf fisherman in my family.  
Cape Hatteras is known worldwide as a Mecca for surf fishing. The rapid expansion of coastal residential development over the last fifty years has significantly reduced the availability of beach access for surf fishing in many areas. The surf fisherman is in danger of becoming extinct due to the loss of suitable ORV beach habitat. Miles and miles of prime surf fishing shoreline have become inaccessible to surf fishing in my lifetime. Towns in Dare, Carteret and other counties have severely restricted ORV use by requiring costly permits and closing access ramps. Snobby private homeowners claim the surf as their private property, even though North Carolina law recognizes all beaches as public. Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area is the best remaining shoreline in North Carolina for surf fishing. It has a good variety of prime fishing areas including inlets, East-facing shoreline, South-facing shoreline and the famed Cape Hatteras Point. It has long stretches of shoreline well suited for responsible ORV vehicle access. This ORV habitat is critical for the survival of the surf fisherman. The management of this prime surf fishing habitat is entrusted the National Park Service to ensure that the rich surf fishing heritage survives and thrives for current and future generations.  
I have recently retired after working forty-three years in product engineering, the last twenty-eight years in a middle management role. I plan to increase my surf fishing activity now that I have more time available. Part of my career success was in learning how to make a balanced decision. I had to balance the product performance and features with the product cost. I had to balance the project development time schedule with the verification testing time. I had to balance the needs of the company with the needs of employees. In every case there was pressure to sway to an extreme position. I had to be diligent and creative to make good balanced decisions.  
My assessment of the DEIS is that the preferred Alternative F does not represent a balanced decision because it is excessively restrictive on ORV use. I

am therefore opposed to Alternative F. I prefer a more common-sense, balanced and reasonable solution that is not offered in any of the DEIS alternatives.

The following are some examples of unreasonable ORV restrictions in the DEIS preferred Alternative F:

Page xxiv: Table E3-3. Summary of Alternative Elements: Vehicle Carrying Capacity Determination The carrying capacity limits listed in the table are arbitrary and unnecessary. Carrying capacity would be difficult and expensive to enforce at Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Carrying capacity is actually self regulating in the real world. If users perceive an area to be too crowded, they will move to a less crowded area or they will return during a less crowded time. I recommend that carrying capacity limits not be included in the ORV plan.

Page 104: Table 8. Summary of Alternative Elements: Hours of Allowable ORV Operation on Beach The proposed limits on ORV night use are excessively restrictive. Some of my most fond fishing memories are the nights catching Whiting under the stars on the beach between the Cape Hatteras Point and the airport. There is no scientific evidence of significant impairment of resources caused by responsible ORV use at night. Occasional incidents in the past do not justify these excessive restrictions. The educational aspect of the proposed ORV permitting process should minimize the risk of night time incidents. The proposed dates and times should be removed from the ORV plan. All areas of the Seashore should continue to be open 24 hours a day year-round to provide those wonderfully unique night time user experiences.

Page 125: Table 10. Species Management Strategies: Night-Driving Restrictions The proposed night-driving restriction from May 1 to Nov 15 is excessive. All areas of the Seashore should continue to be open 24 hours a day year-round to provide those wonderfully unique night time user experiences.

Page 125: Table 10. Species Management Strategies: Nest Closures/Buffers The proposed turtle nest buffer in areas with ORV traffic of 105 meters wide is excessive. All turtle nest areas should be a consistent area of 5 meters by 5 meters bounded by symbolic fencing and signage. I am concerned that a few irresponsible people will be tempted to encroach on a buffer zone that is obviously unreasonably oversized. Bigger is not always better. Smaller buffers will have a lower rate of human intrusion.

Page 127: Table 11. Shorebird /Waterbird Buffer Summary The buffer distances as listed in the table are not based on scientific data and are excessively high distances. I propose the following distances as being more reasonable for ORV users and yet effective in protecting the birds:

Species Breeding Behavior Unfledged Chicks ML1 / ML2 ML1 / ML2 Piping plover 50 meters / 50 meters 200 meters / 200 meters Wilson's plover 50 meters / 30 meters 30 meters / 30 meters AMOY 30 meters / 15 meters 100 meters / 100 meters Least tern 50 meters / 30 meters 50 meters / 30 meters Other CWB 50 meters / 30 meters 50 meters / 30 meters

The DEIS preferred Alternative F appears to be an attempt to minimize the risk of another law suit from the Southern Environment Law Center. I understand the strategy of avoiding law suits. I have seen it practiced in the private business world all too often. But, I believe it is a weak strategy that does not result in the best long term solution. To take the path of doing the right thing for the users of Cape Hatteras National Seashore will require courage. I encourage you to have the courage to take a fresh look at the ORV plan with a focus on use by the people as the primary mission. The people's government established the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area for the use and enjoyment of the people. If the Seashore does not meet the needs of the users, the people's government can dissolve the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area. I am not in favor of such action, but we should all recognize that any organization that loses sight of its mission is doomed to failure.

In addition to serving the needs of the users, you also have to protect the natural resources of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area. I believe this is your secondary mission, but one that can be accomplished by carefully balancing it with the needs of the users. Much of the DEIS details various means of protecting shore birds and sea turtles within the boundaries of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area. While I believe your intent is good, your focus is too narrow to be effective. Those animals do not recognize property boundary lines established by man. They are free to fly, walk or swim anywhere along the Atlantic seaboard. You cannot teach them to obey the park property boundaries. They may visit the Pea Island National Wildlife Refuge and the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area on the same day, or on alternating years. They do not change their behavior just because they cross a property line. You cannot train them to behave in a manner that complies to Cape Hatteras National Seashore rules. They will find their preferred habitats along with their secondary habitats regardless of property lines. Their strong sense of survival also gives them the ability to adapt to new habitats, including urbanized areas. You do not own these creatures. They are not the property of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area. You do not have the sole responsibility to decide their eventual survival or extension. You do not have the capability to control their eventual survival or extension in isolation. The Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area is only a piece of the puzzle. It may not be critical to maintain a specific quota for concerned species within the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area if they are thriving in other areas. This is where making intelligent balanced decisions becomes extremely important.

I believe you need to take a more holistic view of managing the concerned species. You should take a bold leadership position to form a coalition at the regional level. The coalition should include representatives from all publically owned land and environmentally managed private land throughout the natural range of the concerned species. Other municipal and private lands may be represented if they agree to follow a set of common guidelines to manage the concerned species. Additional representatives may include progressive turtle watch groups that have experience in areas where turtles coexist with ORV use. The purpose of the coalition is to share effective management techniques, evaluate new techniques and to maintain the common guideline documentation. The coalition goal cannot be to simply consider the wellbeing of the concerned species in isolation. The coalition must have a broader goal to balance the ORV and other user needs along with wellbeing of the concerned species. If sea turtle eggs can be relocated with good hatch rates in one location to allow for continued ORV use, the methodology should be tried at other locations. If smaller protective buffer zones for sea turtle nests can work in one location for continued ORV use, they should be effective for all locations. If smaller protective buffer zones for shore bird mating, nests and fledgling can work in one location for continued ORV use, they should be effective for all locations. Experimental methods should be encouraged and results should be shared. Management effectiveness measures should be shared to encourage consistent counts and to be able to roll up the data to a regional level view. Professional biologist, scholars, statisticians and scientists should be involved as required. Keep the lawyers, politicians and special interest extremist groups out of it.

Managing concerned species by a holistic approach within their naturally defined habitats rather than by man-made property boundary zones is a dramatic shift for bureaucrats. Sharing and embracing new management methods will require open and objective thinking. This will take courage and it may take some time. The courts may require Cape Hatteras National Seashore to implement an ORV plan before this coalition can become fully operational. Therefore the ORV plan needs to be written to include flexibility to implement future management methods that will be less restrictive to ORV use, while providing adequate and reasonable protection for the concerned species. The trend of more and more restrictions on responsible ORV users needs to be reversed. The DEIS preferred Alternative F is too restrictive on ORV users and should not be adopted.

Your consideration of my comments will be appreciated.

Sincerely,  
Dallas M Weir Jr.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3377    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Johnson, Claude R  
**Received:** May,05,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am a resident of North Carolina and I enjoy the recreational opportunities offered by the Cape Hatteras National Seashore and also Cape Lookout National Seashore further south. It is essential to participation and enjoyment of the Seashores that a reasonable and safe vehicular and or pedestrian access is available to the public. I also support restrictions and conditions necessary the birds, sea turtles and other biota that supported by scientific data and can make the Seashores home for part of the year. I believe that alternative #7 advanced by the NPS is more restrictive than necessary to provide protection of the Seashore. I have read and agree with the proposal to manage ORV's on the Seashore prepared and submitted for consideration by the Coalition for Beach Access. My position is that the NPS accept this alternative or at least postpone a final decision on the ORV plan pending further review and negotiation on the counterpoints raised by the Coalition for Beach Access.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3378    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Wood, Steve

**Received:** May,05,2010 09:46:37

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Cape Hatteras, NC - PLEASE do NOT restrict ORV access to the beaches due to the current minimal disruption that it creates. PEOPLE are responsible for keeping the seashore clean, protecting the dunes, controlling erosion, etc. Vehicles traversing along the sandy shoreline do not have a negative impact, as long as we have dedicated routes on & off the shoreline. Small bird nests in the dunes are not, and have not been negatively impacted in large, by our access to the water. The current regulations work. We do not need to further restrict and govern. Please retain the current access afforded to Sailers (Windsurfing & Kiting), fisherman, Surfers, and general beach walkers. We are ALL nature preservationists and continue to do our part. The current Parks and Recreation Service currently does a great job governing this precious resource. We do not need to further restrict access, in order to continue our positive impact on this environment. =Steve Wood, Annapolis Maryland.

**Correspondence ID:** 3379    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,05,2010 09:51:01

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** As I am writing this letter it seem like the access to our cape hatteras national sea shore for vehicles is in danger.I guest the only thing I can say is that ten years ago I did'nt even know what the outer banks was and I live in the state.I went and I have'nt looked back since,now I try to get there at least four or five times a year.Every year that I go back the access to the beaches is getting smaller and smaller to the point that someone can not even walk on the beach.I do understand the impact that the people that use the sea shore impose on that environment. To sum it up so you don't have to read a long letter about someones life or things I hope you already know.I oppose more restrictions on our beaches,I would love to share that wonderful place with the children of our future.Please don't destroy that for the current political pressures. If you took the time to read this thank you for your time.

**Correspondence ID:** 3380    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** fripp, archibald l

**Received:** May,05,2010 09:55:23

**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 scientist, bird watcher, nature photographer, past member of the Audubon Society, and a concerned citizen, I have supported the present 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 new 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:** 3381    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,05,2010 09:56:01

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I belong to a recreational fishing group called the "Blues Brothers" and we have been fishing at Cape Hatteras for some 20 years. I believe it would be a disaster to close the park area as proposed by the Park Service. We have great respect for the Park and the resources and we consider the fishery there very special. Please keep the beaches open for the people who respect the resource and our children in the future.  
Glenn Curtis

**Correspondence ID:** 3382    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,05,2010 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.

In addition, just this past weekend I took a trip along the Outer Banks. I started at Ocracoke, and worked my way up to Corolla, camping at Ocracoke and Oregon Inlet. While I am well aware of the impacts to wildlife that poor management of ORV's along Hatteras can create, that is not what kept my attention. I was quite honestly disgusted by the status of the beach. At Oregon Inlet, I was more concerned about rolling an ankle on tire tracks than enjoying the Seashore.

This is not a vacation destination. It has turned into a ravaged mess. It's not possible to take a walk on the beach and watch the sun rise--the beach is truly torn apart by tire tracks. Since this trip, I have already steered at least 10 different families away from camping at Oregon Inlet, or even attempting to go to the beach along sections with ORV-access. If this is not remedied, tourism will drop. No mother wants to take their child to a beach where they have to worry about them getting hit by a vehicle driving 30 mph. This is not an exaggeration--I had to walk into the surf to avoid an ORV-er.

I also noticed brochures funded by the OBPA, stating, "Let's use common sense." And I agree, let's. Common sense does not dictate that anyone with four-wheel drive should be able to drive where ever they want. I encourage, you, Superintendent, to use common sense. Will the economy be hurt because surf-fisherman have to use a fishing cart, and (it's crazy, I know) actually WALK to the surf in certain sections of the shore? The draw of the Outer Banks is natural, pristine beaches. Please don't destroy what little of that is left.

I hope that you take the time to read this, and all comments, and make the right decision.

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

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

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

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent

degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3383    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** McCormick, Robert B  
**Received:** May,05,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I would like to express my concern that the off-road crowd is being very vocal and is having way too much voice in the formation of National Park Policy from what I have read of the drafts, particularly in the NPS "preferred plan, Alternative F."  
I am 59 years old, and I see no justification for providing so much access to our national treasures like the National Seashore. I can walk the beach, and I see no reason why anyone needs ORVs to enjoy the seashore.  
I have never seen an ORV ridden by a handicapped person, in fact, mostly they seem to be ridden by youngsters who have no business on them by law and by teenagers and immature young adults who are more interested in the joy of "making donuts" and "doing wheelies" than taking in the scenery. These sorts of activities can be just as readily carried on OUTSIDE the National Parks where their damage to the seashore is less offensive.  
The majority of individuals I have observed riding ORVs have shown little respect or concern for the wildlife and many endangered species who live and nest in these precious areas, and though I presume they can read as well as I can, I have personally observed them display behavior which completely disregards posted regulations.  
Further, the noise of these ORVs detracts greatly from the experience of nature for those of us who visit the National Parks for the all-too-rare experience of nature unspoiled by man  
I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, as stated by the North Carolina Conservation Network statement quoted below:  
We ask that any plan that is approved will do the following:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families 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. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Sincerely, Robert B. McCormick

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3384    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** May,05,2010 10:23:34  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 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. We all deserve equal access and a safe space on a national park beach. Please preserve Cape Hatteras National Seashore and all national parks for everyone's use!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3385    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** May,05,2010 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. We ask that any plan that is approved will do the following:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families 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. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3386    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,05,2010 10:26:23  
**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:** 3387    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,05,2010 10:26:29

**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:** 3388    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,05,2010 10:26:35

**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:** 3389    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,05,2010 10:26:35

**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:** 3390    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.05.2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** To whom it may concern: I grew up on the coast of North Carolina. Now I live in the mountains, but my family is still in coastal North Carolina. I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the 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 ask that any plan that is approved will do the following:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families 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. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thanks, Kim Porter 828-712-4601

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3391    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.05.2010 10:56:13  
**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:** 3392    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.05.2010 10:56:19  
**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:** 3393    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.05.2010 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 own property on a NC barrier island (Bald Head Island), so I understand how difficult it is to preserve the environment. We must make all efforts humanly possible to preserve the fragile environment of a barrier island. Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3394    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.05.2010 10:56:24  
**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:** 3395    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.05.2010 10:56:25  
**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. This is our chance to do the right thing for our world, and our children/grandchildren. Please!  
 The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
 \*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
 \* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
 \* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts 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 invite you to visit the area and see what is at risk. It's one of the most beautiful spots in the world. Part of the beauty is the natural life that is now at risk.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3396    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,05,2010 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.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3397    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Cook, Robert J  
**Received:** May,05,2010 10:57:38  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Good morning,  
I run a kiteboarding business in the Wisconsin area and we work very closely with the local parks to make sure we are proactive with all riding aspects of this sport. We also have a lot of people all throughout the states that come to Cape Hatteras every year and even multiple times a year to kiteboard in the Pamlico Sound and on the ocean. Cape Hatteras has a reputation as one of the best riding locations in the states as well as in the world. It would be a shame to have not only Kiteboarding restricted since it has such a positive influence on so many people. It's a very environmentally friendly sport as well.  
Take care and hope that any restrictions are seen as unnecessary.  
Bob Cook www.kiteridersllc.com

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3398    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,05,2010 10:59:09  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** A sincere Thank You to all Cape Hatteras National Seashore personnel who have had to endure and contend with this unresolved issue for the last 30 years as they attempted to perform their duties in an increasingly stressful and hostile environment.  
Congratulations to NPS staff for finally being able to move this issue toward completion. I know it has not been an easy task.  
What must the area have looked like when it was proposed as the nation's first national seashore? Sparse development with no roads, no power lines, just Nature dominating the scene. Nature still dominates the barrier islands.  
Except for certain areas, the Seashore was suppose to remain a wilderness. Management has not followed through on that aspect of the enabling legislation as marinas, day use facilities, etc have been built. Additional ORV routes have been bull dozed into existence so people could drive to areas that were suppose to remain a wilderness. The enabling legislation needs to be brought to the foreground of the ORV discussion.  
It was the natural beauty of the islands and their unique position along the mid Atlantic coast that made them especially qualified to be the first national seashore. The Organic Act prescribes how the area should be managed, but that law has been ignored as local interests continue to create negative effects for the Seashore in their attempts to degrade and destroy the NPS mission.  
Preserve and protect the Seashore so it remains the incredibly unique area that Nature created. Preserve and protect the flora and fauna. Preserve and protect the natural processes.  
Protect the Seashore from being over run by vehicles and people.  
Remove all the large dumpsters from parking lots, beach access routes, etc. The majority of these dumpsters collect household trash, construction materials, automotive and boat parts, hazardous materials, and anything else that will fit in them. If it doesn't fit in the dumpster it's left laying on the ground next to the dumpster. The majority of dumpsters contribute little to removing actual litter from the Seashore. They are more a place for locals to dump items from private property.  
The NPS should quit subsidizing the county's trash collection at the federal taxpayer's expense. Remove the dumpsters and educate the visitor to carry out what they carry in. Removing dumpsters will improve the NPS operating budget by reducing costs  
Many vehicles do not display vehicle license plates as prescribed by state law because of coolers, rod racks, or other possessions blocking view of the license plate. There are plenty of other plates displayed, those advertising fishing, automotive, or political organizations are often seen, but the vehicle license plate is hidden from view contrary to motor vehicle laws. If a beach driving permit is initiated, this law should be addressed for public safety and officer safety concerns.  
The NPS should do more to educate visitors. Increase funding for interpretive programs that provide interesting, relevant programs which promote awareness of the Seashore's attributes and the NPS mission.  
The NPS should do more to protect the incredible views of the night sky by educating visitors, as well as state and county authorities. Reducing unnecessary night time illuminations saves global energy reserves while protecting wildlife and the natural processes within the Seashore.  
Changes within the Seashore will necessitate changes in the surrounding communities. The current Dare County managers, and local citizens, will have to re tool their approach to the tourist dollars that keeps them in business. Many have a "no retreat" philosophy that entails throwing more tax payer money into keeping things just the way they are, no change is good for them. But the entire history of a barrier island chain, it's entire make up, is one of change in response to natural processes.  
The NPS should continue to protect the natural processes while educating the public that other methods of earning a lively hood exist. The integrity of the Seashore should not be reduced or defaced in order to satisfy local greed or laziness.  
I support option D as the correct method of managing the Seashore and urge the NPS to implement option D.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3399    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Rapant, William L  
**Received:** May,05,2010 11:05:20  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As a resident and business owner on Hatteras Island I am disgusted with the influence of The Audobon Society, it's staff of lawyers, and deep pockets to have influence on the management of the park by the Park Service. Do not accept this from these lobbyists. This is a national recreation area. Implment policies that protect wildlife and ensure access to the beaches for all; not just the bird watchers. This is our state and our park. The park does need the likes of Audobon to limit access for the benefit of their members (at the price of the tax payer), and to overregulate (again, at the price of the tax payers) for their agenda.  
I am thoroughly disgusted with the bureacracy. Give this matter back to the National Park Service for the best local management of the park. Special interest groups with no ties to Hatteras Island need to take their agenda back to Manhattan and stop the intrusion on Hatteras Island.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3400    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,05,2010 11:07:30  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am a life-long resident of North Carolina who enjoys recreational opportunities offered by the Cape Hatteras National Seashore and Recreational Area. Reasonable and safe pedestrian and vehicular access to the beach is essential to participate and enjoy these resources and opportunities. I also support restrictions and conditions necessary to protect the birds, sea turtles, and other biota that are supported by scientific data and can make the Seashore home for part of the year. I believe the favor alternative (#7) advanced by the NPS is more restrictive than necessary to meet protection of the Seashore. I have read and agree with the proposal to manage ORV's on the Seashore prepared and submitted for consideration by the Coalition for Beach Access. My position is that the NPS accept this alternative or at least postpone a final decision on the ORV Plan pending further review and negotiation on the counter points raised by the Coalition for Beach Access. Thank you in advance reviewing my comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3401    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,05,2010 11:22:22

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I have been a frequent visitor to the Outer Banks N.C. for the last 15 years. I also consider myself to be a ecologically conscious person. I have a background in biology and conservation. On my trips to the Outer Banks and have been able to immerse myself in the environment to the extent that is not possible in many areas. I think the policies that are in place work well, and changing that to a more restrictive nature would be detrimental to the region as a whole. I would hope the individuals in charge will vote to maintain the current policies and beach access on the outer banks of N.C.  
Thank you, Adam Cohen Centreville MD

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3402    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,05,2010 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 very concerned about the Outer Banks plan and the emphasis on favoring ORV use. This is a national treasure and we should have a plan in place that minimizes ORV use, preserves the wildlife and supports recovery, and allows people to enjoy this unique national treasure. Please take the time to look past local pressures for ORV use and consider a balanced plan that provides for non-ORV use by families, support for wildlife preservation and recovery, and limits the ORV use.

I agree with the Audubon's principles 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:** 3403    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,05,2010 11:26:32

**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.

Dear Sir

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts 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,

Matt Curran 10208 Riverstone PL Raleigh, NC 27614

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3404    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,05,2010 11:26:38

**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:** 3405    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,05,2010 11:26:44  
**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:** 3406    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Froggatt, Jory L  
**Received:** May,05,2010 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. Any plan that is approved should have the following:  
 1. Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If 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.  
 2. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
 3. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3407    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,05,2010 11:34:47  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best 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:** 3408    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,05,2010 11:35:08  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I have never visited Cape Hatteras, but in the near future I plan to. I am an avid kitesurfer with a great respect for the oceans and their environment. I understand that Hatteras is a National Park, and there are certain restrictions that may be enacted.  
 If these restrictions, which I find to inhibit the experience of the Cape as I understand it come into effect, my visit will be less likely to occur. I don't believe I am alone.  
 Growing up I have heard stories of the experiences of windsurfing on Cape Hatteras, and what a magical place it is. Do the world a favor and preserve access to the Cape for all enthusiasts.  
 I am not aware of the species and environments that are being effected by kitesurfing, ORV use, or fishing. I do, however, understand that most people that enjoy the outdoors have a great respect for the preservation of natural habitats.  
 Continue to enforce ill-willed patrons of your area, don't cut off the circulation to this beautiful National Lakeshore. Preserve Cape Hatteras.  
 Sincerely,  
 Nathan Patterson

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3409    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Jacques, Windsor  
**Received:** May,05,2010 11:41:22  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I suggest that as part of the DEIS the NPS could establish a criteria for the treatment of turtle nests and as part of the criteria allow for relocation of eggs to a safe area in a restricted access part of the beach and as part of the decision to relocate a nest the ranger deciding to or not to relocate can consider beach access along with other criteria such as egg safety.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3410    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,05,2010 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. We ask that any plan that is approved will do the following:  
 Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families 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. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
 Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.?

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3411    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,05,2010 11:56:21  
**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:** 3412    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,05,2010 11:56:21  
**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.

0009728

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

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

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

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3413    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,05,2010 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 very concerned about the DEIS and am very much in favor of strict conservation of our wildlife (water fowl, turtles, etc.) on the Outer Banks of NC. ORV use needs to be carefully monitored so as not to cause disruption of natural habitats. Please don't forget our wildlife here in North Carolina.

Sincerely,  
Sue F. Scattergood 111 Kinnaird Lane Cary, NC 27511

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3414    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,05,2010 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 considerably 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.

\*PLACE NATURAL RESOURCES FIRST.

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

\* ESTABLISH AND MEET CLEAR GOALS FOR WILDLIFE RECOVERY.

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3415    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Stavenger, William  
**Received:** May,05,2010 12:04:34

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** William S. Stavenger 2900 Evergreen Court Chesapeake, VA. 23321  
Reference: (A) Cape Hatteras National Seashore Off-Road Vehicle Plan Draft Environmental Impact Statement Issued March 2010  
Dear NPS Representative,

After spending a significant amount of time attempting to read and comprehend the DEIS (Ref (A)), I find that the document appears to attempt to accomplish two things, develop a balanced seashore environmental plan while also allowing visitor access. Neither task has been accomplished well. The document appears to remove almost all of the rights of the individual to visit and enjoy the Cape Hatteras National Seashore. All involved understand that proper and balanced management of the seashore is a necessity to ensure that a balance exists between man and nature, but the DEIS proposal for management at Cape Hatteras is a conundrum of rules and lawyer speak, that is difficult to decipher. The document is written in a manner to confuse and eventually dis-interest the best of readers who are trying to find out if and when they can drive, walk, fish, collect shells, sunbathe, play Frisbee, fly a kite, watch the shorebirds, see a turtle nesting area, take a disabled adult, child or veteran or walk their 4 legged friend in their Seashore Recreational Area.

It's obvious that Audubon, Defenders of Wildlife and the Southern Environmental Law Center have carefully crafted the document so that those not familiar with "Lawyer Speak and Agenda" will become fatigued from the facts, figures, charts, etc., and possibly just give up in the hope that someone else will be able to understand the document and reasonably "fight the good fight" in order to protect their access rights to the seashore. In other words, as individuals read the document, they see that the proverbial deck has already been stacked in support of a plan to close their seashore. The DEIS document, when combined with the issuing of the April 2008 forced Consent Decree by a Federal Judge, makes a forecast that predicts the end of paradise. Here is my attempt to comment on the DEIS.

1) In reference (a), page 121-127, unrealistic distances are imposed on drivers and hikers to protect shore birds and turtles. The implementation of the

plan will effectively halt all visitations (vehicle and hikers) to all areas of the seashore if nesting areas are such that the 1000 meter exclusion area plan (a buffer size not scientifically justified) is put into place for multiple nesting areas. 2) Page 121-127 - American Oyster Catcher restrictions are almost as severe as the plover area exclusions even though the oyster catcher is not a federally threatened species. 3) Page 136 - Pets, including dogs will not be allowed leashed or unleashed between March 15 and July 31. Requirements for control of pets have already been established by the NPS. Additional controls were not outlined previously by any consent decree. If pets are contained as presently required by the NPS, no harm to the environment is incurred. Removing pets from the beach only results in additional stress to the pet and owner. 4) Page 121 ? Access to the beaches in areas that have always been open will be denied, thus denying traditional, promised cultural use of the land for the people of Hatteras. 5) Night driving restrictions Alternatives B, C, D, E and F are too restrictive. Carefully managed driving at night combined with a reduced night time speed limit, limited vehicle movement and better marking /identification of turtle nesting areas will prevent turtle casualties. 6) Alternative F is just a vessel for turning the Seashore Recreational Area in to a wildlife refuge. Two refuges are already established in close proximity to the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Area, those being Pea Island and the Cedar Island National Wildlife refuge areas. 7) Alternative A, with proper interactive, intelligent management is preferred. Please reconsider the actions and uncompromising aggressive tactics that the lawyers and radical environmentalist organizations have taken to impose the will of those contributors with unlimited resources, on those with little financial backing who are just trying to work or vacation at or near the national seashore in a responsible manner. If the NPS had followed through with the Presidential decree requirements for an ORV plan back in the 70's, the Cape Hatteras National Seashore would most likely not be in the cross hairs of dispute as it is today. The inaction by the NPS then, their preference for Alternative F now and the uncaring attitude I witnessed at the Hampton, VA. (April 29, 2010) hearing on the matter seems to indicate that the NPS just wants it all to be over so that the employees can move on to the next level of laziness and of non-public support.

In closing, I'd like to ask why is it necessary to issue such a lengthy eight-hundred plus page document to tell the public how, when and where they can visit the national seashore recreational area?

To put it all in perspective, the Emancipation Proclamation of 1863, which granted freedom for the slaves, was less than 2 pages in length. Had the NPS, SELC and Audubon Society been around and involved, that document might have been 800 pages and they would probably still be discussing ownership clauses, alternative plans A-F, freeing the slaves at night, exclusion boundaries, times of the year when and where the slaves could be freed and if they could bring their dog with them.

William S. Stavenger Chesapeake, Va. 23321

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3416    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Kuhn, Dana A

**Received:** May,05,2010 12:16:05

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I disagree with Alternative "F" with the restrictions of 1,000 meter pedestrian/ORV closure surrounding unfledged chick brood of piping plover. This restriction is over-kill and will affect access to my property, beach and water. Only reasonable human/animal/bird/reptile living in unison creativity is acceptable.

I disagree with Alternative "F" in the distance restrictions placed upon pedestrian/ORV surrounding Oystercatcher nest and broods. Oystercatcher species is not federally threatened. Human/bird harmony must be considered in a reasonable win/win.

I disagree with Alternative "F" regarding prohibiting pets on the beach. However, I agree that pets must be leashed and that pet wastes must be picked up and disposed of responsibly.

I disagree with Alternative "F" prohibiting ORV's year round between ramps 23 and 27 at Hatteras inlet and ocracoke Island inlet. Requiring permits for ORV during daylight hours is reasonable.

I disagree with Alternative "F" prohibiting night driving, but do agree in promulgating a law restricting beach access to ORV 1 hour before sunrise and 1 hour after sunset.

I disagree with Alternative "F" restricting pedestrian beach access from March 15 to July 31 (p. 121) at the different beach locations. Again creating a human/bird harmony is essential and is achievable for a win/win.

Pea Island is a preserve which should thrive encouraging species to nest, reproduce and live with guided human interaction.

I disagree with Alternative "F" as I do not see where sufficient scientific and socio-economic studies have been conducted to support such restrictions which are being proposed.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3417    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,05,2010 12:21:14

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** The natural beauty and wildlife, as well as family ties to the Outer Banks are the reasons that inspired us to build a rental property in the Salvo community of Hatteras Island.

As we all know, life on Hatteras can be very challenging, given its weather patterns, and now perhaps indications of global climate change. Even in the best of economic times, it can be difficult for life-long residents and those of us owning rental properties. With the economic downturn in recent years, it has become increasingly more difficult to attract vacationers to Hatteras Island, and sometimes difficult to obtain services as companies have downsized their operations or limited their service areas in order to save money. At a crucial time when when all of us who own vacation properties are trying to survive and to keep our renters coming back to the island, it would be devastating for the National Park Service to dramatically restrict access to Hatteras Island beaches.

As one who loves Hatteras Island and is concerned for its economic well-being, I urge the National Park Service not to adopt Alternative F of the DEIS, but to consider a more balanced approach that will preserve the Island's natural habitat and wildlife as well continue to attract visitors and vacationers for years to come. I support the need to maintain the environmental integrity of the island, but it must be done in such a way that the economic and cultural way of life on the island is not irreparably damaged.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3418    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,05,2010 12:26:31

**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:** 3419    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,05,2010 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.  
Viewing wildlife and providing a safe home for wildlife in our national seashores is very important to me.  
Pedestrians and families with children need to feel safe from vehicles. Motor vehicles have no place on beaches.  
The entire country is paved with places for motor vehicles. Our national parks should be an exception.  
Please put natural resources first. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection.  
The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be INCREASED if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Please establish and meet clear goals for wildlife recovery.  
A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities.  
Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3420    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,05,2010 12:26:31  
**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:** 3421    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,05,2010 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 Cape Hatteras National Seashore Park is crucial to the survival of birds and other wild-life.  
It is also crucial that we show the next generation that we wish to preserve places where they can walk, places away from gasoline powered vehicles. .  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 3422    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,05,2010 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 both a long-time property owner on Ocracoke Island, and as a concerned member of our local Audubon Society here in North Carolina, I urge you to take the long view and manage the National Park for its wildlife first, people second. As you know, people are adaptable and can move their recreational activities. Many of the animals such as our piping plovers, are not so adaptable. Please see my article about plovers from Wildlife in North Carolina magazine, April 2007. [http://www.annerunyon.com/coastal\\_courtship.pdf](http://www.annerunyon.com/coastal_courtship.pdf)  
I agree with the National Audubon Society's recommendations written below my closing.  
Sincerely, Anne Runyon (of both Gamer and Ocracoke, North Carolina) mailing address: Anne Runyon 1116 Poole Drive Garner, NC 27529

---

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

**Correspondence ID:** 3423    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,05,2010 12:26:43  
**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:** 3424    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,05,2010 12:26:43  
**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.  
I would like to voice my strong opposition to the admittance of ANY recreational vehicles, except for emergency ones and those belonging to handicapped persons on the beaches of Hatteras. There are three grounds for this. First most of the territory of the US is already dedicated to powered vehicles and the natural world of Hatteras and its flora and fauna must be preserved. Secondly those of us that seek peace and quiet should have a few places left that are not polluted by vehicles and their noise a stench. Thirdly it is bad enough that so much energy and oil are wasted at NASCAR and other events aimed at destroying the only planet we have. We need to start conserving energy rather than drill-baby-drilling ourselves to oblivion.  
Sincerely Dr Jacob Folmer 109 Hundt Club Lane #D Raleigh NC 27606

**Correspondence ID:** 3425    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** sailor, nigel  
**Received:** May,05,2010 12:46:45  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I think all the beach should be off limits to driving but not to walking. We can't just spill our oil all over the place and drive all over every inch of the

beach. We need the ecosystem intact and supportive of the biodiversity that makes a natural place like the seashore so valuable and beautiful!  
Thank You

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3426    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,05,2010 12:49:13  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** To whom it may concern, I made my second trip To Cape Hatteras last year for a kiteboarding trip. spent a week in mid May. It was one of the best trips for kiting. I plan on coming back the end of May again for another week. It would be very sad to me and many others if the Areas used for kiteboarding, fishing, kayaking, etc would be closed down there. I am all for the environment and ensuring nothing happens to the wildlife. However closing it down to everyone does not sound like the answer. You have a many people that make a living on the tourism of fisherman, kilters, beach goers. What will happen if no one is allowed on these beaches. Please think about this. I want to come back every year and spend my hard earned money at a fantastic place. Sincerely, Michael Santacroce

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3427    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,05,2010 12:49:21  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please give the people our beaches back. Full access is needed for the people.  
1- To Be Closed Year Round: Hatteras Inlet, North End Ocracoke Island, Ramp 27-Ramp 30 (Salvo)  
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!  
3- Large, inflexible buffers (p.121-127) Up to 1000 meters for piping plovers!  
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- NPS will NOT adopt more proactive techniques used at other east coast locations to encourage turtle nesting success-WHY? (p392-396)  
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- NPS: OK to relocate Turtle nests when storms are imminent, but not before. (Coincidentally the high-risk nests are in prime ORV corridors)  
8- "...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  
9- NPS: 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).  
10- Nowhere is it clearly addressed that the OVERWHELMING majority of negative impacts will be felt by the small businesses in the seashore villages rather than by overall economic interests within the region of influence(ROI).  
Thanks Jim

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3428    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,05,2010 12:56:30  
**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:** 3429    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,05,2010 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. The latter, in particular, is of great importance to me. Already humans, mainly through climate change, are doing great damage to wildlife on this planet. Such environmental change along with urbanization has been particularly damaging to birds, altering their nesting locations and migration patterns. We should take every opportunity to protect these animals, and Alternative D provides such an opportunity.  
At the very least, the following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be

0009733

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

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3430    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Gaskins Jr., Lloyd E

**Received:** May.05.2010 12:57:01

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I have reviewed the proposed DEIS and do not approve of any of the 6 alternatives provided I feel the buffers are to large and not based on current peer reviewed information. I have also reviewed the Coalition for Beach access and feel that it not only meets the intent of the executive orders but provides for a more enjoyable visitor experiance at Cape Hatteras. This proposal has been signed by several members who were active in the negotiated rule making process and should be considerdc for adoption. I would ask that the closure of the area from ramp 27 to ramp 30 not be considered as a option. That area provides relief for the people of the RWS area from the over crowding of people from the nags head area. I thank you reading my comments as I can not present them in person. I am currently on active duty in KOSOVO and will not be back ianything in time to submit any comments in person.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3431    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May.05.2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** As a lifetime resident of North Carolina, avid birder, and champion of conservation of our natural resources, I appreciate the opporunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. Wild bird beach nesting sites are rare on our heavily populated coast. I heartily support the position of the National Audubon Society on the preservation and protected use of this rich national seashore treasure, as follows: Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opporunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. There is plenty of room for fishermen and the habitats needing protection!

I strongly support the adoption of the following principles that should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

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

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

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

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts 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,

Phil R. Poovey 4720 Glen Forest Drive Raleigh, NC 27162

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3432    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** cilio, corrado M

**Received:** May.05.2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Mike Murray, Superintendent Cape Hatteras National Seashore 1401 National Park Drive Manteo, NC 27954

May 5, 2010

Mr. Murray,

It has been brought to the attention of the kiteboarding community that a variety of plans are being considered in response to proposed environmental and ecological concerns. The Outer Banks of North Carolina is a sanctuary for many beach goers, sports enthusiasts, wildlife observers and most importantly, the natural environment. Of course it is important for the environment to be protected and thus certain steps may be needed to achieve this goal. However, with the aforementioned said, please consider the responses you choose carefully. Minimalist environmental management approaches have worked well throughout the National Parks in the United States and other countries like Sweden. Closing extensive sections of beaches, the sound, and water ways will strip away 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 wildlife.

Should the environmental changes impact the communities' sport (as it would in Plans D, E, & F) we would be forced to reconsider our frequent and environmentally friendly utilization of the Outer Banks. Other user groups such as surfers, fishermen, beachcombers, and virtually all other forms of tourism will also be discouraged from visiting Cape Hatteras if beach closures are greatly expanded. I can imagine that this will have a severely negative impact on the local economy. Only me and my family spend several thousand dollars every year as tourists and so do all our friends. It will take away something that is important to thousands of people throughout the United States and around the world.

The nature has to be lived and protected, has to be part of our life with harmony and not with prohibitions, the nature is there for us and rules should only help us to enjoy with respect.

Best Regards,

Corrado M. Cilio, M.D., Ph.D. Professor of Pediatrics Dept. of Clinical Sciences Skene University Hospital Lund University 205 02 Malmo, Sweden

---

0009734

**Correspondence ID:** 3433    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.05.2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:**

It has been brought to my attention that a variety of plans are being considered in response to proposed environmental and ecological concerns. The Outer Banks of North Carolina is a sanctuary for many beach goers, sports enthusiasts, wildlife observers and most importantly, the natural environment. I, feel that it is important for the environment to be protected and thus understand certain steps may be 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 away 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 wildlife. Should the environmental changes impact our communities' sport (as it would in Plans D, E, & F) I and many vacationing kite-boarders, would be forced to reconsider our frequent and environmentally friendly utilization of the Outer Banks. Other user groups such as surfers, fishermen, beachcombers, and virtually all other forms of tourism will also be discouraged from visiting Cape Hatteras if beach closures are greatly expanded. This will have a severely negative impact on the local economy and way of life that the residents of Hatteras Island have enjoyed for many generations. It will also take away something that is important to the lives of thousands of people throughout the United States and around the world. If people, and especially children, can not experience the environment how are they going to learn to help you protect the environment?  
Kind Regards Richard Hollobon

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3434    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.05.2010 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 firmly believe that the main function of our National Parks is to preserve the living, geological and historical resources contained within each area under its jurisdiction for future generations to appreciate. The taking of wildlife by the public should only be allowed in a park if it does not negatively impact these resources which are held in trust. In this case, primarily fishermen, want to take living things from a national park to the detriment of many of the other species the park is designed to protect. I personally think that there should be no fishing in national parks since fishes need protected areas too. But when sportsmen can drive on our beaches at all seasons of the year it definitely disrupts bird and turtle breeding which is a huge impediment to preserving them for future generations to enjoy. We end up sacrificing the things the park is designed to protect long-term for the short term gratification of a vocal minority of the populace. I think the compromise offered is overly generous to the ORV drivers. I think that their access should be more limited. However, I am willing to go along with it for the time being. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts 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, Jesse Perry 1308 Ashburton Rd. Raleigh, NC 27606

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3435    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.05.2010 13:33:32  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:**

I am strongly opposed to the species eradication by the NPS as described on page 124 of the DEIS. I don't understand who gave the NPS the power of GOD to make life and death determinations as to one specie's survival over another. I would also like for someone to explain to me why a herbivore (white tail deer) was shot by the NPS to protect a plover. It would seem that some rangers shoot animals just because they are allowed to, not because plover were being threatened. With the small number of plovers that use Cape Point and Hatteras Inlet this seems like a dangerous waste to me.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3436    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Lowe, Bryan A  
**Received:** May.05.2010 13:40:30  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:**

Superintendent, Cape Hatteras National Seashore:  
I do not agree with the Audubon. Please do not allow these radical environmental groups to bully you into doing something that will harm all visitors, locals, businesses and the character of the OBX. These people are not from here and have no business trying to change our beach. This is America and last time I looked it was a democracy. You have heard from many more concerned locals than the handful of wingnuts in Raleigh. I believe there is some middle ground to be found. I along with many many others cannot live here if this is allowed to pass the way the Audubon and the Raleigh nut cases want it to. Common sense is all I ask. Your comments are welcome.  
Bryan Lowe 252-441-7307

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3437    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Jones, Eliot  
**Received:** May.05.2010 13:42:30  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

0009735

**Correspondence:** Please do not ever allow offshore oil drilling near the coast of North Carolina. I would hate to have to move my family away because of this.  
Thanks,  
eliot

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3438    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.05,2010 13:43:31  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As a resident of North Carolina, I treasure both the unique natural beauty and diversity of our seashore as well as my ability to access it and enjoy it. In fact, those two things are highly correlated and dependent on one another - without healthy biology the value of access is diminished and without access, appreciation for the ecology is diminished. I fear that an overly restrictive ORV plan on Cape Hatteras National Seashore will severely diminish the value of this resource to citizens of our state from both a usage as well as economic impact standpoint. The NPS must balance carefully the objectives of protecting the resource WHILE MAINTAINING traditional, cultural, recreational and commercial values to the public. I believe the proposal submitted by the Coalition for Beach Access is an appropriate balance of these tenets and I urge the NPS consider this submission in formulation of the ORV plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3439    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.05,2010 13:45:50  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I support alternative c. Thank you. Brian Paradise

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3440    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.05,2010 13:47:53  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I don't understand why this whole mess has gotten so far out of hand. The right of the Natives (and tourist) to beach access must be maintained and the protection of birds and turtles is just as important. This could be done fairly for the Natives (and tourist) and the birds and turtles if it was not for special interest groups with deep pockets and unreasonable people who have to have it their way or no way. Wetlands for parking is a good example. Please be fair, use your head, keep politics and money out of the decision process and make a decision that works for everyone. It can be done!!!!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3441    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Strong, Timothy P  
**Received:** May.05,2010 13:48:41  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I do not think any natural area, every area with its own diwstinct beauty and dignity, should be assaulted with the degradations ORV use always create, just because those areas are 'accessible.'  
There is enough noise, gasoline-consumption, competitive hostility created by neanderthals whose only entertainments are those, to allow extension of them in this area, one of the treaaures of the State. Their 'vocal' nature is just one more source of noise,

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3442    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Boeh, Mitch J  
**Received:** May.05,2010 13:49:28  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please do not restrict recreational access for beach goers. This a wonderful place for people to vacation and it would be a shame if humans weren't allowed to visit.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3443    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.05,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Mike Murray, Superintendent Cape Hatteras National Seashore 1401 National Park Drive Manteo, NC 27954  
May 5, 2010  
Mr. Murray,  
It has been brought to the attention of the kiteboarding community that a variety of plans are being considered in response to proposed environmental and ecological concerns. The Outer Banks of North Carolina is a sanctuary for many beach goers, sports enthusiasts, wildlife observers and most importantly, the natural environment. We, as a community, feel that it is important for the environment to be protected and thus understand certain steps may be 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 away 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 wildlife.  
We strongly feel that the Historical, Cultural, and Economic ramifications of the proposed plans have not been adequately addressed by the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) as is required.  
Should the environmental changes impact our communities' sport (as it would in Plans D, E, & F) we would be forced to reconsider our frequent and environmentally friendly utilization of the Outer Banks. Other user groups such as surfers, fishermen, beachcombers, and virtually all other forms of tourism will also be discouraged from visiting Cape Hatteras if beach closures are greatly expanded. This will have a severely negative impact on the local economy and way of life that the residents of Hatteras Island have enjoyed for many generations. It will also take away something that is important to the lives of thousands of people throughout the United States and around the world.  
If people, and especially children, can not experience the environment how are they going to learn to help you protect the environment?

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3444    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.05,2010 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. We ask that any plan that is approved will do the following:

Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families 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. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3445    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,05,2010 13:56:43  
**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:** 3446    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,05,2010 13:56:43  
**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:** 3447    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,05,2010 13:56:43  
**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.

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3448	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596
<b>Name:</b>	Frank, Harriette M				
<b>Received:</b>	May,05,2010 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. For many years, my family and I have enjoyed vacationing on the Outer Banks, a state and national wildlife treasure which we want to remain intact for future generations of people as well as the animals who depend on its resources for their lives. Of the 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 ask that any plan that is approved will do the following: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families 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. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.?				
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3449	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596
<b>Name:</b>	Mullinax, Janet g				
<b>Received:</b>	May,05,2010 14:02:19				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	The National Park Service is supposed to be for all the people, not a select few. My family vacations at the coastal area and it would be a tragedy for many people. Our economy is in poor condition as it is. Please keep the beaches open for all our sakes...				
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3450	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596
<b>Name:</b>	Matthews, Catherine E				
<b>Received:</b>	May,05,2010 14:12:10				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please protect the Hatteras Beaches. After all, this is a National Seashore. I live in the Piedmont but I am buying a place at Stumpy Point. I grew up fishing on the Outer Banks and as an adult continue to fish and bird watch. I own a 4-wheel drive vehicle because I enjoy driving on the beach to find privacy and also I can transport elderly relatives. Have you ever tried the beach wheel chairs? They are wonderful but very difficult to use. HOWEVER, I am willing to sacrifice driving on any beach to protect nesting birds, nesting turtles or other wildlife. No one has a "right" to drive on the beach if it negatively impacts the numbers of these threatened/endangered/uncommon species or common species for that matter. I will be content driving through Kill Devil Hills in the off-season. Please protect our beaches. It is now or never. Thank you.				
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3451	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596
<b>Name:</b>	private				
<b>Received:</b>	May,05,2010 14:25:37				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please. I beg you. Look at the Gulf Coast right now. if we destroy the Outer Banks then what are we left with. Short term gratification for those who want to drive on such a delicate ecosystem will ruin the long term economic viability for the state for years to come.				
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3452	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596
<b>Name:</b>	private				
<b>Received:</b>	May,05,2010 14:25:43				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Keep our beach access open! We live and work here to enjoy the beaches for fun and employment. Closures will slow our already straining economy and cause more locals to relocate. NO BEACH CLOSURES!!!!				
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3453	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596
<b>Name:</b>	N/A, N/A				
<b>Received:</b>	May,05,2010 14:27:58				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Keep vehicles off our beaches				
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3454	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596
<b>Name:</b>	private				

**Received:** May,05,2010 14:29:58  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Don't close our beaches! My business relies on locals and visitors enjoying the OBX and Hatteras island beaches. NO CLOSURES!

**Correspondence ID:** 3455    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,05,2010 14:30:07  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I agree with Alternative D with the following exceptions: I - I disagree with the concept that vehicle transport corridors are not always behind dunes. They should be as well as being separated from pedestrian corridors. Corridors from near the Cape Hatteras Lighthouse southwest to Frisco and where there is room, in the False Point area near Hatteras Inlet should suffice. Corridors such as these make sense because they can be moved inland until there is no more room as sea levels rise.\* II - I disagree with stacking limits one vehicle deep since this does not address carrying capacity relative to weight as this relates to the sinking sedimentary material of the Albemarle Embayment comprising Hatteras beaches with the possible exception of soapstone deposits off Salvo. It is also unacceptable in favor of ORVs and allows insufficient pedestrian only corridors and access. I recommend a lottery system to control excessive ORV use of beaches as a condition of Alternative D. III - I disagree with absence of true wilderness areas with no vehicles, no pedestrians and no roads or human trails. These should be included as a part of Alternative D.  
\*See USGS Fact Sheet FS-076-00 June, 2000, variable #6. \*Personal communication from Dr. E. Robert Thieler of the US geological Survey, Woods Hole, MA, regarding the particular vulnerability of sink sedimentary material making up the Albermarle Embayment. April 4, 2010.

**Correspondence ID:** 3456    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** May,05,2010 14:38:55  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** We need to protect the wildlife and marinelife who use our shores for nesting, eating, etc. We need to not allow these people who want to drive on these shores during certain times of the year. I'm sorry if businesses are being hurt by this but that was because this should never have been allowed in the first place. If we don't stop to protect the wildlife and marinelife, they will go extinct. Must we wait until they are extinct before people will realize their importance to the ecosystem? I hope not. I believe that we need to protect our beautiful shores for eternity and in time, these people who think they should be allowed to drive on these shores will eventually accept it. If they continue to disregard the law, please make the penalty 10 times whatever you want to punish them now and enforce it regardless of who they are. It's time they learn to follow the laws in our great state and not destroy our coast just because they are angry.

**Correspondence ID:** 3457    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** May,05,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Mike Murray, Superintendent Cape Hatteras National Seashore 1401 National Park Drive Manteo, NC 27954  
May 5, 2010  
Mr. Murray,  
It has been brought to the attention of the kiteboarding community that a variety of plans are being considered in response to proposed environmental and ecological concerns. The Outer Banks of North Carolina is a sanctuary for many beach goers, sports enthusiasts, wildlife observers and most importantly, the natural environment. We, as a community, feel that it is important for the environment to be protected and thus understand certain steps may be 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 away 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 wildlife.  
We strongly feel that the Historical, Cultural, and Economic ramifications of the proposed plans have not been adequately addressed by the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) as is required.  
Should the environmental changes impact our communities' sport (as it would in Plans D, E, & F) we would be forced to reconsider our frequent and environmentally friendly utilization of the Outer Banks. Other user groups such as surfers, fishermen, beachcombers, and virtually all other forms of tourism will also be discouraged from visiting Cape Hatteras if beach closures are greatly expanded. This will have a severely negative impact on the local economy and way of life that the residents of Hatteras Island have enjoyed for many generations. It will also take away something that is important to the lives of thousands of people throughout the United States and around the world.  
If people, and especially children, can not experience the environment how are they going to learn to help you protect the environment?

**Correspondence ID:** 3458    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,05,2010 14:48:04  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Mr. Murray,  
My family and I have spent countless hours enjoying the unique beauty of the Hatteras Island beaches. I'm saddened to learn the very same beaches I walked on while pregnant with my first son, who will be 32 this year and is expecting a son of his own in June, has been allocated for ORV access. This will not only effect the aesthetic beauty that continues to draw us to it's shores, but will be extremely uninviting to the majority of visitors--and pose a danger to a once child friendly beach.  
Our family held it's reunion in Hatteras last year--as we have on numerous occasions. If the plan to designate so many miles of prime beaches is granted to ORV access goes through, it will no longer be safe for my nieces and nephews (and future grandchild) to run freely as they try to set their kites aloft, or to just sit contentedly, building castles in the sand.  
Deborah Cowal

**Correspondence ID:** 3459    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,05,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Mike Murray, Superintendent Cape Hatteras National Seashore 1401 National Park Drive Manteo, NC 27954  
May 5, 2010  
Mr. Murray,  
It has been brought to the attention of the kiteboarding community that a variety of plans are being considered in response to proposed environmental and ecological concerns. The Outer Banks of North Carolina is a sanctuary for many beach goers, sports enthusiasts, wildlife observers and most importantly, the natural environment. We, as a community, feel that it is important for the environment to be protected and thus understand certain steps

may be 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 away 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 wildlife.

We strongly feel that the Historical, Cultural, and Economic ramifications of the proposed plans have not been adequately addressed by the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) as is required.

Should the environmental changes impact our communities' sport (as it would in Plans D, E, & F) we would be forced to reconsider our frequent and environmentally friendly utilization of the Outer Banks. Other user groups such as surfers, fishermen, beachcombers, and virtually all other forms of tourism will also be discouraged from visiting Cape Hatteras if beach closures are greatly expanded. This will have a severely negative impact on the local economy and way of life that the residents of Hatteras Island have enjoyed for many generations. It will also take away something that is important to the lives of thousands of people throughout the United States and around the world.

If people, and especially children, can not experience the environment how are they going to learn to help you protect the environment?

Thank You for listening,

Darren Bass

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3460    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,05,2010 14:56:48  
**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.  
It is becoming increasingly clear that we, the people of this planet, need to act with concern for the environment. I have given up a power boat for a kayak, a dirtbike (motorcycle) for a pedal bike, purchased a Hybrid vehicle instead of a new 5.0 Mustang. I think the National Parks, State Parks, funded by tax dollars as much as access fees, belong to all people - those here now, and those to follow - with the prime understanding that the parks must be preserved, not destroyed. ORV do not preserve. They do not provide for future generations, they are not caretakers of the land, nature, wildlife, or sustainable practices. It is not the mission of the Park Service to provide for people who abuse and/or damage the public lands and trusts. ORV people can purchase private property for their purposes. It is not the responsibility of, or in the interest of the great majority of citizens to permit public lands and their intrinsic habitat to be destroyed for the self-interests of a small few. Please act on behalf of the environment, on behalf of our National Treasures, on behalf of the land and waters and wildlife by ending the destructive practices of people who have other alternatives. Thank you from myself, my sons, and my grandchildren.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3461    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,05,2010 15:08:16  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Keep the beach access open and unrestricted to all watersports

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3462    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,05,2010 15:26:45  
**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:** 3463    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,05,2010 15:28:08  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Mike Murray, Superintendent Cape Hatteras National Seashore 1401 National Park Drive Manteo, NC 27954  
May 5, 2010  
Mr. Murray,  
Thank you for your service and stewardship at the Cape Hatteras National Seashore. As you may probably guess, this letter concerns the proposals under consideration to further limit human access to the shore under the guise of ORV regulation and wildlife management.  
I, like millions of other beach users, would prefer to see the least restriction applied!  
The only sensible course seems to me to be a return to the status quo ante consent decree. The legitimacy and standing of the party supporting the consent decree has never been properly established, and the decree merely solves a problem for the court, not the citizenry, the wildlife, or the NPS!  
Any further restrictions imposed will be to the detriment of all parties. The more closures, the worse will be the impact on open park (and non-park) areas, the quality of life in neighboring developed areas, and economic viability of the region. These foolish schemes under consideration will have

a negative impact on the state of North Carolina as a whole, the NPS itself, and the millions of people who visit and bring economic and social well-being to the outer banks!

I pray that someone with more influence than an ordinary citizen, someone like yourself, will be brave enough to point out how wrongheaded the management schemes and outlined in the draft and related decrees and orders really are, and stand up for the forgotten constituency in this debacle: the human beings! While the little birdies and antedeluvian reptiles have fearsome legal representation and intense pressure groups, we the humans have only you! Please remember who you are working for.

Once again, as a human being and a North Carolina beach user (and yes, very occasional driver), I thank you for your service to the citizens of the United States and the people of the world in administering this beautiful area. I hope the park service will not bow to the unreasonable pressures being applied to ruin the future enjoyment of the outer banks!

Sincerely,  
Byrd W. Davenport III

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3464	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596		
<b>Name:</b>	Cowal, Rory						
<b>Received:</b>	May.05.2010 15:31:15						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Hello, as a frequent visitor to the Outer Banks as a tourist, I'm very disappointed to learn of this plan to allow more ORV use. I believe that this plan threatens the pristine beauty of the outer banks which draws me to visit each year and I am reluctant to return if ORV use increases. Please reconsider. Thank you, Rory Cowal.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3465	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May.05.2010 15:41:12						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Hatteras is one of the kind! It is an amazing peaceful place, that has its charm. It might get sometimes disrupted by weekly tourists, fishermen; however, tourism is necessary evil that keeps it alive. Tourists put food on our tables. Money that they spend, are income to the budget that allows us to keep it as it is. If we do those significant changes it will slowly drive them away to another destination. How we gonna feed our children, protect flowers, repair roads damaged by Mother Nature???						
	Please try to reconsider. Thank you.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3466	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May.05.2010 15:44:18						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	HELP. DONT TAKE BEACHES AWAY.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3467	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May.05.2010 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Mr. Murray, It has been brought to the attention of the kiteboarding community that a variety of plans are being considered in response to proposed environmental and ecological concerns. The Outer Banks of North Carolina is a sanctuary for many beach goers, sports enthusiasts, wildlife observers and most importantly, the natural environment. We, as a community, feel that it is important for the environment to be protected and thus understand certain steps may be 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 away 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 wildlife. We strongly feel that the Historical, Cultural, and Economic ramifications of the proposed plans have not been adequately addressed by the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) as is required. Should the environmental changes impact our communities' sport (as it would in Plans D, E, & F) we would be forced to reconsider our frequent and environmentally friendly utilization of the Outer Banks. Other user groups such as surfers, fishermen, beachcombers, and virtually all other forms of tourism will also be discouraged from visiting Cape Hatteras if beach closures are greatly expanded. This will have a severely negative impact on the local economy and way of life that the residents of Hatteras Island have enjoyed for many generations. It will also take away something that is important to the lives of thousands of people throughout the United States and around the world. If people, and especially children, can not experience the environment how are they going to learn to help you protect the environment?						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3468	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596		
<b>Name:</b>	Lakatos, Andrew						
<b>Received:</b>	May.05.2010 15:56:22						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please do not close more beaches. Hatteras Island visitors vacation in this area specifically to gain access to these beaches. The type of visitor that goes to Hatteras does have great respect for the island and the environment.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3469	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May.05.2010 15:56:47						
<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:** 3470    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.05.2010 15:56:47  
**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:** 3471    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.05.2010 16:01:26  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** please keep access the same.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3472    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** May.05.2010 16:10:12  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 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. We all deserve equal access and a safe space on a national park beach. Please preserve Cape Hatteras National Seashore by maintaining its integrity as a natural resource, not a parking lot.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3473    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Houston, Amy B  
**Received:** May.05.2010 16:16:07  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Hello. My husband and I visit Hatteras Island for about a total of 2 months every year. We camp in our camper and spend our days at the beach. We drive out onto the beach and swim, fish and enjoy time spent with our friends. Over the last 12 years we have probably brought about 25 friends from home to Hatteras to vacation with us. And out of those, about 20 have made it their yearly vacation spot. We all drive from Indiana (about 14 hours) and love to drive on the beach. We spend our money at local businesses. If we are unable to drive on the beaches, we will probably find somewhere else to vacation. We would hate to do that, though. Because we love Hatteras and the beautiful beaches. People are respectful and clean up after themselves and others. Please don't close these beaches. If they are closed to even foot traffic, how will generations to come even understand the beauty and the reason we should protect it if they can't even enjoy it?

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3474    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.05.2010 16:26:50  
**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:** 3475    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,05,2010 16:35:41  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As a Hatteras Island property owner, teacher, writer, and nature photographer, I believe we are all stewards of our environment. No one wants to see any animal become endangered. Although I neither fish nor own a beach vehicle, I strongly believe the dynamic beauty of the Outer Banks can be shared and enjoyed by families, fishermen, and wildlife.  
I do NOT support closing the beaches on Hatteras Island year round to vehicular traffic. I do NOT support closing the beaches to leashed pets. I do NOT support fencing off a square mile of beach for a bird's nest.  
We need a rational plan that protects wildlife and recognizes the recreational and economic value of the Outer Banks.  
Thank you, Jean Fripp

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3476    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,05,2010 16:43:01  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I disagree with the methods used for the analysis of socioeconomic data in the DEIS (PG 270-281, 561-598). NPS included the northern beach communities and other areas of Dare and Hyde counties in the Region of Influence. For a realistic view of the economic impact of the Consent Decree, NPS must look at the areas that are affected by it: Hatteras and Ocracoke Islands' only, since this is the area where access has been denied. For an accurate evaluation, NPS should consider the first full year the islands were under the Consent Decree: 2009. 2008 statistics reflect reservations that were made in 2007, pre-Consent Decree. Overall seashore visitor accounts do not accurately reflect beach use. Many people visit other attractions, ie the lighthouses, and then leave without ever setting foot on the beach! In August 2009, peak season, a drive down Highway 12 in Buxton revealed hotel after hotel with Vacancy signs. Comfort Inn and Cape Pines were offering discounted rooms. Outer Beaches Realty was offering discounts and interest free bookings for 2010. These are not signs of a bustling economy. The northern beaches may have been bustling but in the area affected by the Consent Decree, people were and are hurting.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3477    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,05,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Mr. Murray,  
It has been brought to the attention of the kiteboarding community that a variety of plans are being considered in response to proposed environmental and ecological concerns. The Outer Banks of North Carolina is a sanctuary for many beach goers, sports enthusiasts, wildlife observers and most importantly, the natural environment. We, as a community, feel that it is important for the environment to be protected and thus understand certain steps may be 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 away 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 wildlife.  
We strongly feel that the Historical, Cultural, and Economic ramifications of the proposed plans have not been adequately addressed by the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) as is required.  
Should the environmental changes impact our communities' sport (as it would in Plans D, E, & F) we would be forced to reconsider our frequent and environmentally friendly utilization of the Outer Banks. Other user groups such as surfers, fishermen, beachcombers, and virtually all other forms of tourism will also be discouraged from visiting Cape Hatteras if beach closures are greatly expanded. This will have a severely negative impact on the local economy and way of life that the residents of Hatteras Island have enjoyed for many generations. It will also take away something that is important to the lives of thousands of people throughout the United States and around the world.  
If people, and especially children, can not experience the environment how are they going to learn to help you protect the environment?  
Kind Regards, Greg Fowler and family.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3478    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,05,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Mr. Murray,  
It has been brought to the attention of the kiteboarding community that a variety of plans are being considered in response to proposed environmental and ecological concerns. The Outer Banks of North Carolina is a sanctuary for many beach goers, sports enthusiasts, wildlife observers and most importantly, the natural environment. We, as a community, feel that it is important for the environment to be protected and thus understand certain steps may be 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 away 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 wildl ife.  
We strongly feel that the Historical, Cultural, and Economic ramifications of the proposed plans have not been adequately addressed by the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) as is required.

Should the environmental changes impact our communities' sport (as it would in Plans D, E, & F) we would be forced to reconsider our frequent and environmentally friendly utilization of the Outer Banks. Other user groups such as surfers, fishermen, beachcombers, and virtually all other forms of tourism will also be discouraged from visiting Cape Hatteras if beach closures are greatly expanded. This will have a severely negative impact on the local economy and way of life that the residents of Hatteras Island have enjoyed for many generations. It will also take away something that is important to the lives of thousands of people throughout the United States and around the world.

If people, and especially children, can not experience the environment how are they going to learn to help you protect the environment?

Kind Regards,  
Don Bourque

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3479    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,05,2010 16:56:51  
**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:** 3480    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,05,2010 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 an Audubon member, and a person who is enriched deeply by the natural world, I am increasingly concerned about the loss of adequate habitat and protected areas for nesting and general support for birds in migratory patterns. We're living in a time where the precious relief we humans enjoy from the beauty of the natural world and all the many species that make life worth living, is at risk. Please give these comments and the extremely well reasoned work of Audubon and SELC your attention, your consideration, and ultimately your support.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3481    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,05,2010 16:57:06  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Keep the access open!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3482    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** May,05,2010 16:57:46  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** At a time when we are watching one of our coastlines destroyed, the very thought of allowing vehicles of any kind on Cape Hatteras is obscene! ORV's are destructive to the wildlife, the beaches, and impare the enjoyment of the majority of people who walk and explore along our shore!  
PLEASE! ORV's are destructive toys! Save our beautiful Hatteras! Please, please, please do not allow any type of vehicles on Cape Hatteras!

**Correspondence ID:** 3483    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Sudderth, Shannon  
**Received:** May,05,2010 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. We ask that any plan that is approved will do the following:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families 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. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until 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 native of North Carolina and a frequent visitor to the coast, it matters greatly to me that we preserve this unique habitat both for the visitors to follow and for the wildlife that lives there.

**Correspondence ID:** 3484    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,05,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Mr. Murray,  
It has been brought to the attention of the kiteboarding community that a variety of plans are being considered in response to proposed environmental and ecological concerns. The Outer Banks of North Carolina is a sanctuary for many beach goers, sports enthusiasts, wildlife observers and most importantly, the natural environment. We, as a community, feel that it is important for the environment to be protected and thus understand certain steps may be 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 away 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 wildlife.  
We strongly feel that the Historical, Cultural, and Economic ramifications of the proposed plans have not been adequately addressed by the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) as is required.  
Should the environmental changes impact our communities' sport (as it would in Plans D, E, & F) we would be forced to reconsider our frequent and environmentally friendly utilization of the Outer Banks. Other user groups such as surfers, fishermen, beachcombers, and virtually all other forms of tourism will also be discouraged from visiting Cape Hatteras if beach closures are greatly expanded. This will have a severely negative impact on the local economy and way of life that the residents of Hatteras Island have enjoyed for many generations. It will also take away something that is important to the lives of thousands of people throughout the United States and around the world.  
If people, and especially children, can not experience the environment how are they going to learn to help you protect the environment?  
Kind Regards, Edward Kim

**Correspondence ID:** 3485    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,05,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am writing to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage Off Road Vehicle use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. To me the crucial issue is protecting wildlife and maintaining quiet, undisturbed beaches.  
Of the 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 oppose the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, in which ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This is unfair and potentially devastating to 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 including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for considering these comments!

**Correspondence ID:** 3486    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Corbett, Crystal and James  
**Received:** Apr,26,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** I disagree with the NPS" Plan F" socioeconomic analysis. The region of influence includes all the northern beaches, not just the Hatteras Island beaches. I have seen a 30% decrease in my business here on the island. Many businesses have suffered as a result of the closures and decreased fishing.

**Correspondence ID:** 3487    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Lahmer, Markus  
**Received:** May,05,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Mr. Murray,

It has been brought to the attention of the kiteboarding community that a variety of plans are being considered in response to proposed environmental and ecological concerns. The Outer Banks of North Carolina is a sanctuary for many beach goers, sports enthusiasts, wildlife observers and most importantly, the natural environment. We, as a community, feel that it is important for the environment to be protected and thus understand certain steps may be 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 away 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 wildlife.

We strongly feel that the Historical, Cultural, and Economic ramifications of the proposed plans have not been adequately addressed by the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) as is required.

Should the environmental changes impact our communities' sport (as it would in Plans D, E, & F) we would be forced to reconsider our frequent and environmentally friendly utilization of the Outer Banks. Other user groups such as surfers, fishermen, beachcombers, and virtually all other forms of tourism will also be discouraged from visiting Cape Hatteras if beach closures are greatly expanded. This will have a severely negative impact on the local economy and way of life that the residents of Hatteras Island have enjoyed for many generations. It will also take away something that is important to the lives of thousands of people throughout the United States and around the world.

If people, and especially children, can not experience the environment how are they going to learn to help you protect the environment?

Kind Regards,  
Markus Lahmer

**Correspondence ID:** 3488    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Corbett, Crystal and James

**Received:** Apr,26,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** I disagree with the NPS proposed Plan F. Most of us live on the sound side, making it impossible to walk to the beach-it would be miles to walk. Also, unless one rents an oceanfront house. or at the most 4 or 5 rows back. it is impossible to walk with small children, chairs, coolers, umbrellas, and other things for such a long distance. We need more parking lots and board walks over to the beach. There are not enough. This is why so many people need to drive to the beach.

**Correspondence ID:** 3489    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Corbett, Crystal and James

**Received:** Apr,26,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** I disagree with the fact that the birds on the dredge islands are not counted among the population. They are increasing in huge numbers there, but not along the shoreline.

**Correspondence ID:** 3490    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,05,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** 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).  
I agree with the need to ask the question: Why has NPS never made public a list of reported incidents? Because  
? 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)  
I disagree with the statement made by NPS: Shorter Off-Season ORV access on South-facing Villages (p. xix)  
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)  
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)  
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). (Bodie Island & 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". 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)  
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)  
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? By eliminating this vast stretch of beach which is already off limits to ORV access it makes the beach parcels they intend on closing look like a smaller percentage of the overall resource area under closure to ORV.  
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. Isn't it ironic that the DEIS has a collage of pictures on the very first depicting surf fishing and ORV usage, but all this 810 page document does is limit the access based on false science.  
I disagree with the NPS definition that Large, Inflexible Buffers be used, (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. If the area is closed around the clock from the nest to the surf line, it cuts off all access. Closing all the way to surf line blocks access to the entire beach. It would be better managed if the access were allowed to pass below the surf.

I agree with a Closure to surf line from 1 hour before sunset until dawn, monitored by Turtle Night Nest Watch Team because the proposed Night Driving Restrictions Penalize Pedestrian and ORV users. Education and awareness are the most beneficial to all parties involved. Simply eliminating access is not "managing" the resource. And the resource is supposed to be available to all parties.

I disagree with the NPS barriers 105 meters wide (p.125) this cuts off all access and one nest at the beginning of two consecutive ramps would block the entire section of beach between the two ramps. This does not take into account all of the beach between two different nests that are cut off completely because the blockage is all the way to the surf line leaving zero passage. I agree with the statement that "Closure should be 10 meters square during the day" This is a more effective way to allow for access. The plan should cover off-road vehicle access, not total off-road vehicle elimination. Eliminating access is not "managing" it.

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.

It is perfectly acceptable to have dogs tethered utilizing the six foot leash rule.

I disagree with the NPS position: "Even with resource closures in place, protected species are still at risk [from pedestrians and ORVs]." (p. 210)

I agree with facts related to current ORV access that:

? 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.

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?

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 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

The inclusion of the Northern Beaches in analysis significantly dilutes estimates of economic impact on the Seashore Villages.

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.

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.

Why is it OK to include all of these extraneous areas when it comes to Region of Influence (ROI); but NOT ok to include the populations of birds that exist on the dredge islands?

.

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"

? This is all conjecture on the part of NPS. There is no documented evidence to support their accusations. They are merely speculating on a worst case scenario. Education and awareness are the best tools for the job here. An educated informed public addresses the true spirit of "managed" resource as opposed to total elimination of beach access, which requires no "management". ? 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 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" seabach 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).

I disagree with the NPS assessment of Restrictive Species Management Areas (p. 468) Where they state:

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 & ORV corridor thru SMA at Cape Point, South Point

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 & nesting season (within guidelines) to maintain access.

I disagree with the NPS assessment of Limited Pedestrian and ORV Corridors (p. 468) because:

NPS: Only recognized in ML2 managed SMAs NPS: SMA management reverts to standard buffers when bird breeding activity first observed

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.

In conclusion:

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.

I disagree with the speakers at the public hearings being limited to three minutes to address an 810 page document!!!

Supposedly the Park Service has budget issues. Have they published the cost of doing this do called impact? I disagree with this 810 page document even being called the DEIS. Since when did it become DEIS? It's supposed to be an off-road vehicle management plan. The title includes Cape Hatteras National Seashore and it includes the word off-road vehicle management plan. So why is it referred to as D(draft) EIS. Why is it referred to as CHNSORVMPEIS?

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3491	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	
<b>Name:</b>	lamm, james s.					
<b>Received:</b>	May,05,2010 17:26:09					
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	i think this a great plan keeping off road vehicles off of public access to many of us take small children with us set a side a place for them if you can out of the way of people and children because every ond should enjoy oue seashore in the park thank you JAMES S. LAMM					
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3492	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b> Y
<b>Name:</b>	private					
<b>Received:</b>	May,05,2010 17:27:01					
<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>					
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3493	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b> Y
<b>Name:</b>	private					
<b>Received:</b>	May,05,2010 17:27:01					
<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>					
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3494	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b> Y
<b>Name:</b>	private					
<b>Received:</b>	May,05,2010 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>Dear Superintendent Murray,</p> <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>					

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts 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,

Erica Edelman 1527 Palmers Grove Church Rd. Hillsborough, NC 27278

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3495    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,05,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I have been visiting the Outer Banks since the early 1980's annually. I understand the likeliness for a knee jerk reaction in light of the recent oil spill in the Gulf of Mexico. But I hope you realize the reason people go back every year. I am a surfer, windsurfer & kitesurfer. The OBX is the Mecca for all wind sports, not to mention fishing and most serene coastsl area in the U.S.A. As a man who loves the outdoors I also respect the need to preserve our seashore.  
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 away 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 wildlife.  
We strongly feel that the Historical, Cultural, and Economic ramifications of the proposed plans have not been adequately addressed by the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) as is required.  
Should the environmental changes impact our communities' sport (as it would in Plans D, E, & F) we would be forced to reconsider our frequent and environmentally friendly utilization of the Outer Banks. Other user groups such as surfers, fishermen, beachcombers, and virtually all other forms of tourism will also be discouraged from visiting Cape Hatteras if beach closures are greatly expanded. This will have a severely negative impact on the local economy and way of life that the residents of Hatteras Island have enjoyed for many generations. It will also take away something that is important to the lives of thousands of people throughout the United States and around the world.  
If people, and especially children, can not experience the environment how are they going to learn to help you protect the environment?  
Semper Fidelis,  
John F. Brosnan III

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3496    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Nemezc, Attila  
**Received:** May,05,2010 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. We ask that any plan that is approved will do the following:  
Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not provide enough area free of disturbances so that wildlife populations can rebound. While fishing is an important tradition along the Outer Banks, there is no reason to allow ORVs to hinder the recovery of plovers and sea turtles. Beaches with ORV access end up becoming tailgating parties. This does not provide a natural experience for visitors or 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 including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.?

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3497    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Gnecco, Gregg  
**Received:** May,05,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Mike Murray, Superintendent Cape Hatteras National Seashore 1401 National Park Drive Manteo, NC 27954  
May 5, 2010  
Mr. Murray,  
It has been brought to the attention of the kiteboarding community that a variety of plans are being considered in response to proposed environmental and ecological concerns. The Outer Banks of North Carolina is a sanctuary for many beach goers, sports enthusiasts, wildlife observers and most importantly, the natural environment. We, as a community, feel that it is important for the environment to be protected and thus understand certain steps may be 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 away 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 wildlife.

We strongly feel that the Historical, Cultural, and Economic ramifications of the proposed plans have not been adequately addressed by the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) as is required.

Should the environmental changes impact our communities' sport (as it would in Plans D, E, & F) we would be forced to reconsider our frequent and environmentally friendly utilization of the Outer Banks. Other user groups such as surfers, fishermen, beachcombers, and virtually all other forms of tourism will also be discouraged from visiting Cape Hatteras if beach closures are greatly expanded. This will have a severely negative impact on the local economy and way of life that the residents of Hatteras Island have enjoyed for many generations. It will also take away something that is important to the lives of thousands of people throughout the United States and around the world.

If people, and especially children, can not experience the environment how are they going to learn to help you protect the environment?

Sincerely, Gregg Gnecco

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3498    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,05,2010 17:56:57  
**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:** 3499    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,05,2010 17:56:57  
**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:** 3500    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,05,2010 17:57:03  
**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:** 3501    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

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

**Received:** May,05,2010 17:58:53

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am a resident of North Carolina who enjoys recreational opportunities offered by the Cape Hatteras National Seashore and Recreational Area. Reasonable and safe pedestrian and vehicular access to the beach is essential to participate and enjoy these resources and opportunities. I also support restrictions and conditions necessary to protect the birds, sea turtles, and other biota that are supported by scientific data and can make the Seashore home for part of the year. I believe the favor alternative (#7) advanced by the NPS is more restrictive than necessary to meet protection of the Seashore. I have read and agree with the proposal to manage ORV's on the Seashore prepared and submitted for consideration by the Coalition for Beach Access. My position is that the NPS accept this alternative or at least postpone a final decision on the ORV Plan pending further review and negotiation on the counter points raised by the Coalition for Beach Access."

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3502    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,05,2010 18:18:12

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I live in the northwest and just last year switched to Kiteboarding as a low environmental impact sport. The sport requires no motors or fuel just simply harnesses the power of the wind. The sport does however require access to beaches. I hope your plan will accommodate for this. Kiteboarding is a new sport that and will continue to bring economic benefit without environmental detriment to areas that encourage and cultivate the sport. I hope to visit Cape Hatteras next year like my friends did this past April.  
Thanks, john

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3503    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Walter, George M

**Received:** May,05,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Mr. Murray,  
It has been brought to the attention of the kiteboarding community that a variety of plans are being considered in response to proposed environmental and ecological concerns. The Outer Banks of North Carolina is a sanctuary for many beach goers, sports enthusiasts, wildlife observers and most importantly, the natural environment. We, as a community, feel that it is important for the environment to be protected and thus understand certain steps may be 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 away 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 wildlife.  
We strongly feel that the Historical, Cultural, and Economic ramifications of the proposed plans have not been adequately addressed by the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) as is required.  
Should the environmental changes impact our communities' sport (as it would in Plans D, E, & F) we would be forced to reconsider our frequent and environmentally friendly utilization of the Outer Banks. Other user groups such as surfers, fishermen, beachcombers, and virtually all other forms of tourism will also be discouraged from visiting Cape Hatteras if beach closures are greatly expanded. This will have a severely negative impact on the local economy and way of life that the residents of Hatteras Island have enjoyed for many generations. It will also take away something that is important to the lives of thousands of people throughout the United States and around the world.  
If people, and especially children, can not experience the environment how are they going to learn to help you protect the environment?

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3504    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,05,2010 18:26:58

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3505    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.05.2010 18:26:58  
**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:** 3506    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** May.05.2010 18:37:25  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please refrain from limiting public beach access on Hatteras island.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3507    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.05.2010 18:42:53  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I have read through some of the proposals in the DEIS. I am very concerned with the proposed restrictions in some of the proposals to ORV use in the National Park. To restrict use for such a large area for such an extended period of time seems capricious and egregious. To prevent beach access by car to the most remote areas is overboard. There must be alternatives to shutting beach access down completely. To restrict driving before sunrise and sunset further narrows the window for those looking to be at the water during those most beautiful times, sunrise and sunset. I am a homeowner in Avon. My house rents well into October due to the fishing that attracts visitors. I am very worried what further restriction to beach access by ORV may do to my rental activity throughout the rental season. Many visitors come just for the fishing that they find in the national parks. It is a wonderful experience to drive the beach looking for just the right trough to drop a few lines. To carry all of your gear out for hundreds of yards limits the potential fisherman to one group, decatheletes. It should be obvious to anyone that looks that fishing drives the economy of Hatteras Island. Avon, Buxton, Frisco and Hatteras survive economically on the fishing visitors that come every year to enjoy Cape Point and many other spots that can be found by ORV. I hope the final plan will balance the human, economic and wildlife concerns so that all three can thrive.  
Rob Cabaniss

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3508    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Christopher, Caroline  
**Received:** May.05.2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the 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 ask that any plan that is approved will do the following:  
**PROVIDE EQUAL ACCESS FOR ALL VISITORS.** Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families 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**. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be **BASED ON THE BEST SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH**. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be **INCREASED IF NECESSARY** to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
**ESTABLISH AND MEET CLEARLY DEVELOPED AND STATED GOALS FOR WILDLIFE RECOVERY.** A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the **POTENTIAL OF THE SEASHORE TO SUPPORT WILDLIFE** rather than on its recent degraded abilities!! Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, **ADDITIONAL PROTECTIVE MEASURES** should be implemented until 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, as North Carolinians are in possession of a rare national treasure that must be rescued, rehabilitated and preserved for future generations. In it's conserved state, it will provide healthy and responsible recreation for the more than 2 million visitors it hosts each year. Please do not allow the interests of a drastically smaller and more local percentage of visitors to the Cape Hatteras area to outweigh the interests of millions that can likely be enlisted to aid in the conservation of the seashore they hold in their hearts and that they surely desire to remain as a healthy ecosystem for them to visit again and again and to support economically.  
-Caroline Christopher Chapel Hill, NC

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3509    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.05.2010 18:46:19  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** ORV vehicles interfere with the mission of National Parks and National Seashores in that they are noisy, emit noxious pollutants, and harm wildlife by scaring it away from feeding/nesting area, or actually destroy/kill hatchlings and eggs. The ORVs contribute to the endangerment of species such as Least Terns and Piping Plover.  
 Priority in our federally owned land is the preservation of that land, the ecosystems, and the habitats. In ecologically sensitive areas, types of visitation need to be monitored and restricted. Non-damaging visits, such as nature walkers, photographers, birdwatching (as long as birders adhere to a non-harrasment code) and other passive users of the land - they are fine. However, the ORV vehicles not only work against the land preservation ethic, they interfere with the other visitors' visitation experience.  
 An ORV does not need to visit ecologically sensitive areas. They can be restricted populated areas with no diminishment of their experience (which is to drive on sand). The passive users - they need quiet, freedom from fumes, and undisturbed wildlife.

**Correspondence ID:** 3510    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Madre, Sandy L  
**Received:** May.05.2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Mr. Mike Murray, Supt. Cape Hatteras National Seashore 1401 National Park Drive Manteo, NC 27954  
 Supt. Murray  
 Please accept this letter as my comment5 on the ORV DEIS before you at this time.  
 After reviewing the NPS DEIS I must disagree with any of the six alternatives within the document.  
 I have; however, reviewed the 77 page Coalition for Beach Access Poaition Statement signed by several groups that were a part of the negotiated rule making process and it by far succeeds in furnishing the best visitor experience while maintaining the needs of protecting the fragile resources.  
 Please consider all aspects of this alternative and put people back into the management of Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 3511    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Ducharme, Sheri W  
**Received:** May.05.2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Mike Murray, Superintendent Cape Hatteras National Seashore 1401 National Park Drive Manteo, NC 27954  
 May 5, 2010  
 Mr. Murray,  
 It has been brought to the attention of the entire Outer Banks community that a variety of plans are being considered in response to proposed environmental and ecological concerns. The Outer Banks of North Carolina is a sanctuary for many beach goers, sports enthusiasts, wildlife observers and most importantly, the natural environment. We, as a community, feel that it is important for the environment to be protected and thus understand certain steps may be 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 away 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 wildlife.  
 We strongly feel that the Historical, Cultural, and Economic ramifications of the proposed plans have not been adequately addressed by the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) as is required. I am the manager of St. Clair Landing Campground in Rodanthe, on Hatteras Island. In our current economic environment, our campground business has remained steady. The comments made by our guests typically reflect the need to take advantage of less-expensive vacation alternatives provided by camping. Having said that, please be aware that since the implementation of the Decree Order, we have had numerous guests cancel their trips, either entirely, or they cut them short, dependent completely on the opening and closure of the beach access. When Ramp 23 and 27 were closed last year, our average guest stay decreased from 4 days to 2 days. Families who have been renting campsites from us for years, and in some cases, since we opened 16 years ago, have made changes to their regularly-planned trips with us to go elsewhere. Simply put, if the beach is not available to our visitors, then our visitors have no reason to come to our beautiful Outer Banks.  
 Should the environmental changes impact our communities' sport and our ability to sustain a business (as it would in Plans D, E, & F) we would be forced to reconsider our frequent and environmentally friendly utilization of the Outer Banks. Other user groups such as surfers, fishermen, beachcombers, and virtually all other forms of tourism will also be discouraged from visiting Cape Hatteras if beach closures are greatly expanded. This will have a severely negative impact on the local economy and way of life that the residents of Hatteras Island have enjoyed for many generations. It will also take away something that is important to the lives of thousands of people throughout the United States and around the world.  
 If people, and especially children, can not experience the environment how are they going to learn to help you protect the environment?  
 Thank you, Sheri Ducharme Manager, St. Clair Landing Campground

**Correspondence ID:** 3512    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.05.2010 18:57:03  
**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:** 3513    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,05,2010 18:57:06  
**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:** 3514    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,05,2010 18:57:06  
**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:** 3515    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,05,2010 19:00:06  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I agree with NPS that "ORV's 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". Access corridors are essential to the continuation of ORV beach access. Access corridors should be established and maintained year round to allow ORVs and pedestrians to get on to the beach. It is understood that portions of the beach will at times be closed due to wildlife activity but there should be an access corridor that skirts any closure so people can get around it. ORV's are the most practical means of access for fishermen, disabled people, families, the elderly...anyone who has equipment to transport onto the beach.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3516    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Potter, Nancy  
**Received:** May,05,2010 19:01:45  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I would like to register my objection to the closing of the beaches of the Hatteras Island Seashore. My husband and I built a house in Salvo, NC three years ago after visiting and falling in love with the area. The beaches are the reason people visit Hatteras Island - without access to the beaches there will be no visitors. If there are no visitors the island will become a ghost town - most owners of the thousands of rental homes depend on the income derived from the rental of their houses to make monthly mortgage payments. Without this income, the foreclosure rates will certainly rise. The majority of jobs on Hatteras Island are tied to the tourist trade. Without tourists there will be no need for restaurants, shops, grocery stores, real estate companies, construction companies, etc. What will happen to all of the people that work here? How will the local government replace the lost revenue from taxes that will not be paid on real estate, sales, etc? I understand the need to preserve our seashores - the residents and visitors of Hatteras Island have co-existed with nature for hundreds of years - drastic measures are not needed to continue this relationship. KEEP OUR BEACHES OPEN!

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3517	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,05,2010 19:04:47						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please accept this letter as my comment on the ORV DEIS. After reviewing the NPS DEIS,I must disagree with all of the six alternatives within the document. I have,however,reviewed the Coalition for Beach Access Position Statement signed by several groups.These groups were a part of the negotiated rule making process and it by far succeeds in furnishing the best visitor experience while maintaining the needs of protecting the fragile resources. Please consider all aspects of this alternative and put people back into the management of Cape Hatteras National Seashore.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3518	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596		
<b>Name:</b>	O'Neal, Lianne J						
<b>Received:</b>	May,05,2010 19:07:42						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	"Even with resource closures in place, protected species are still at risk." The risk to protected species from pedestrians and ORVs is minute, provided that resource closures are clearly marked and adequate public education is provided. To date, no protected species have been killed by visitor/residential ORVs at Cape Hatteras National Seashore.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3519	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596		
<b>Name:</b>	Kassakian, Steven						
<b>Received:</b>	May,05,2010 19:23:56						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I would like to offer my opinion regarding the proposed ORV management plan for Hatteras Island. As a conservationist and avid recreational water user I do not see any mutual exclusion in either of these pursuits. It would be very unwise to severley restrict pedestrian traffic in the National Seashore. Being able to walk, fish, windsurf, kite or just relax on the beach is incredibly important for many people and helps to teach about the importance of protecting these areas. Severely restricting pedestrian access, as proposed in plan F with 1000m buffer for piping plover nest is incredibly onerous and shortsighted. While allowing natural areas to remain basically undisturbed by mankind is a laudable goal it is important to allow access so that the treasure that these places are can remain so.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3520	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,05,2010 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Mr. Murray, It has been brought to the attention of the kiteboarding community that a variety of plans are being considered in response to proposed environmental and ecological concerns. The Outer Banks of North Carolina is a sanctuary for many beach goers, sports enthusiasts, wildlife observers and most importantly, the natural environment. We, as a community, feel that it is important for the environment to be protected and thus understand certain steps may be 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 away 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 wildlife. We strongly feel that the Historical, Cultural, and Economic ramifications of the proposed plans have not been adequately addressed by the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) as is required. Should the environmental changes impact our communities' sport (as it would in Plans D, E, & F) we would be forced to reconsider our frequent and environmentally friendly utilization of the Outer Banks. Other user groups such as surfers, fishermen, beachcombers, and virtually all other forms of tourism will also be discouraged from visiting Cape Hatteras if beach closures are greatly expanded. This will have a severely negative impact on the local economy and way of life that the residents of Hatteras Island have enjoyed for many generations. It will also take away something that is important to the lives of thousands of people throughout the United States and around the world. If people, and especially children, can not experience the environment how are they going to learn to help you protect the environment? Kind Regards, Ramon F. Rodriguez						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3521	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,05,2010 19:27:05						
<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>	3522	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.05.2010 19:27:10  
**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:** 3523    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Mathews, Randal G  
**Received:** May.05.2010 19:29:10  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 5/5/2010  
 To: NPS

I am greatly concerned that the areas on Ocracoke that were open 10 years ago have slowly been closed to all public access. South Point is one of these areas. I believe parts of this area should be closed but I also believe the total acreage removed from public access has caused crowding on the beach which Ocracoke has never experienced. There is very limited public sound side access on Ocracoke Island. There are 6 access roads inside the Park between the Ferry Terminal and the NPS Campground. 2 of these are locked year round to the general public and the other 4 are no more than dirt paths with a place to turn around. We have no sound side access as user friendly as the north and south ends of Ocracoke Island and now they are closed to all public access when most of the visitors are here. There is not a single acre of National Seashore on Ocracoke Island that is flat sand like the South Point of Ocracoke. Now it is closed. I am disturbed at the closure of the areas that have traditionally attracted the most visitors. South Point on Ocracoke Island is the prime fishing and surfing area of Ocracoke Island. I am saddened by the most recent prenesting maps because I know that they are calculated for eventual total closure either by nesting or vandalism whichever comes first. The ML1 designation is the most unreasonable. The ML1 designation should not be used. I cannot believe this has happened to the CHNS on Ocracoke Island. The changes I have seen to the Park in the last 30 years have been many but these changes have hurt the Park, the local residents, but most of all, the public. Future generations will not enjoy the National Seashore in the same way. I am fearful of what will happen to recreational areas of our Parks and public lands. Why have these wonderful recreational hot spots been closed and turned into wildlife preserves? The beach on at the southern end of Ocracoke Island was closed this week (ML1 designation) for a species of bird (American Oystercatcher) that is not considered endangered even by the state of North Carolina. This sort of action undermines the integrity of the USFW and NPS. There is no one accountable to the public for these actions. The biologist working on The CHNS are under constant pressure from private citizens who want the beaches closed. ORV advocates are being ignored. Access is being denied and the data being used for closures is not being reviewed in a professional manner. This is what many year round lifetime residents are witnessing. Along with the loss of income to the local economy. The DEIS document must have been written by someone who has no knowledge of the local geography and socioeconomic impact that beach closures have created. A 1000 meter buffer zone completely covers South Point from Ocean to Sound. This is a shameful example of the carelessness of the people who wrote the DEIS. These actions have caused overcrowding where there was no overcrowding before. The access Ramp # 68 has never been a user friendly access because of the steep angle of the beach and the very powdery sand that collects at the dune line during southwest winds. Southwest winds are the prevailing summer winds according to all NWS data. So why is Ramp #68 even considered open? Even the most skilled and experienced drivers avoid this ramp. This is well known to all local NPS personnel. It is disingenuous to show this access as usable. The mileage is also shown as part of the sum of accessible beach. This is the sort of thing that builds contempt from the public. Inaccessible beach should not be added to a map or used for any data for what is considered open to the public. The data used to justify the closures in the CHNS is said to be based on the best science available. It is really based on selective science. I hope the NPS will less restrictive and more proactive in its efforts to manage people and wildlife in the CHNS.  
 Randal Mathews Ocracoke Island

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3524    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.05.2010 19:29:52  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Folks, please reconsider allowing off-road vehicles (ORV) practically unlimited access to CHNS. I understand that pressure is great to allow these vehicles, and "the squeaky wheels get the grease." However, just because the people who drive all over the beach are the most vocal doesn't discount those of us who perhaps don't make as much noise and enjoy the beach quietly and non-invasively. Keep CHNS safe for pedestrians' quiet enjoyment.

Having drivers roaring up and down the seashore will compromise the most desirable qualities of Cape Hatteras: the wildness, the quiet open space; the many species of wildlife inhabiting the area. I have vacationed at the Outer Banks several times over the last 20 years and have always considered it a unique and valuable asset to our National Park System. Please don't let the squeaky wheels get all the grease this time; leave some for those of us who enjoy the solitude at Cape Hatteras. Thank you for your time.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3525    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Scheinman, Daniel  
**Received:** May.05.2010 19:33:03  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I recently learned that a variety of zoning ideas are being considered in response to proposed environmental concerns. Hatteras Island is a sanctuary for many beach goers, sports enthusiasts, wildlife observers and most importantly, the natural environment. I feel that it is important for the environment to be protected and thus understand certain steps may be needed to achieve a proper balance.

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 away 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 wildlife. That is why we come, play, and live here.

We strongly feel that the Historical, Cultural, and Economic ramifications of the proposed plans have not been adequately addressed by the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) as is required.

As vacation home owner in Avon, NC, I have a personal interest in the future of Cape Hatteras. We have built a house which is named Nature's Point with the intent to honor the natural environment it sits in.

Should the environmental changes impact our enjoyment of our beloved beaches(as it would in Plans D, E, & F) we would be forced to reconsider our frequent and environmentally friendly utilization of the Outer Banks. Other user groups such as surfers, fishermen, beachcombers, and virtually all other forms of tourism will also be discouraged from visiting Cape Hatteras if beach closures are greatly expanded. This will have a severely negative impact on the local economy and way of life that the residents of Hatteras Island have enjoyed for many generations. It will also take away something that is important to the lives of thousands of people throughout the United States and around the world.

If people, and especially my children, can not experience the environment how are they going to learn to help you protect the environment?

Kind Regards,  
Daniel Scheinman

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3526	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,05,2010 19:43:07						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Closing access for recreation is wrong for so many reasons. I travel with friends year round to Cape Hatteras and spend a lot of money when I come! I know what it is like on the off season and what the local economy is based on and from just a fiscal perspective you will pay if this passes. I kiteboard and closing access in Hatteras will be detrimental to the sport and all of those who love to celebrate the beauty of the ocean. Around the world people in the kite world know of Hatteras, your beautiful beaches grace every top magazine and site. I have a family home in MD and still choose to come down to Hatteras as much as I can as nothing compares! Allow sports as kiting and surfing that have no negative impact on the beach or waters to continue! I absolutely love Hatteras but without kiting access I will not return as I have and will stay with my local beaches that do allow kiting access. Thank you for voting FOR Cape Hatteras Continued Recreation Access!						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3527	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,05,2010 19:46:30						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please keep Hatteras open to the public!						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3528	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,05,2010 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Mr. Murray, It has been brought to the attention of the kiteboarding community that a variety of plans are being considered in response to proposed environmental and ecological concerns. The Outer Banks of North Carolina is a sanctuary for many beach goers, sports enthusiasts, wildlife observers and most importantly, the natural environment. We, as a community, feel that it is important for the environment to be protected and thus understand certain steps may be 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 away 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 wildlife. We strongly feel that the Historical, Cultural, and Economic ramifications of the proposed plans have not been adequately addressed by the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) as is required. Should the environmental changes impact our communities' sport (as it would in Plans D, E, & F) we would be forced to reconsider our frequent and environmentally friendly utilization of the Outer Banks. Other user groups such as surfers, fishermen, beachcombers, and virtually all other forms of tourism will also be discouraged from visiting Cape Hatteras if beach closures are greatly expanded. This will have a severely negative impact on the local economy and way of life that the residents of Hatteras Island have enjoyed for many generations. It will also take away something that is important to the lives of thousands of people throughout the United States and around the world. If people, and especially children, can not experience the environment how are they going to learn to help you protect the environment? Kind Regards, Joe						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3529	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,05,2010 19:52:25						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please work to provide a balance of access and the enviornment. THIS is public land and the citizens have the right to access these lands. I have been going to CapeHatteras for 40 years and dont want to see beach access taken away.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3530	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596		
<b>Name:</b>	johnson, robert w						
<b>Received:</b>	May,05,2010 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I am a lifelong resident of Norht Carolina who along with my family enjoys the recreational oppertunitiesoffered by the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area. Reasonable and safe pedestrian and vehicular access to the beach is essential to participate and enjoy these recourses and opportunities. I also support restrictions and conditions necessary to protect the birds, sea turtles and other biota that are supported by scientific data and can make the Seashore home for part of the year. I believe the favor alternative (#7) advanced by the NPS is more restrictive than is necessary to protect the Seashore. I have read and agree with the proposal to manage orv's on the seashore prepared by rthew Coalition for Beach Access. My position is that the PS accept this alternative or at least postpone a final decision on the orv plan pending further review and negotiation on the counter points raised by the Coalition for Beach Access.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3531	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596		
<b>Name:</b>	Scheinman, Jon						

**Received:** May,05,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Mr. Murray,

It has been brought to the attention of the kiteboarding and windsurfing community that a variety of plans are being considered in response to proposed environmental and ecological concerns. The Outer Banks of North Carolina is a sanctuary for many beach goers, sports enthusiasts, wildlife observers and most importantly, the natural environment. We, as a community, feel that it is important for the environment to be protected and thus understand certain steps may be 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 away 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 wildlife.

We strongly feel that the Historical, Cultural, and Economic ramifications of the proposed plans have not been adequately addressed by the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) as is required.

Should the environmental changes impact our communities' sport (as it would in Plans D, E, & F) we would be forced to reconsider our frequent and environmentally friendly utilization of the Outer Banks. Other user groups such as surfers, fishermen, beachcombers, and virtually all other forms of tourism will also be discouraged from visiting Cape Hatteras if beach closures are greatly expanded. This will have a severely negative impact on the local economy and way of life that the residents of Hatteras Island have enjoyed for many generations. It will also take away something that is important to the lives of thousands of people throughout the United States and around the world.

If people, and especially children, can not experience the environment how are they going to learn to help you protect the environment?

Kind Regards, Jon Scheinman, M.D. - a lifetime windsurfer and visitor to Avon, NC, now a homeowner there.

**Correspondence ID:** 3532    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Hales, Jennifer L

**Received:** May,05,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Hi, my name is Jenn Hales and I am a local business owner living in Raleigh NC. It's very important to me that we keep our beaches beautiful and pristine, not only in order to support wildlife but also to encourage tourism in the state.

I think allowing off-road-vehicles on the beach sends the wrong message; instead of a quiet and serene location that people want to visit and take care of, ORVs make our beaches loud, degraded and unsafe.

I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the 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 ask that any plan that is approved will do the following:

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

Thank you,

Jenn Hales

**Correspondence ID:** 3533    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Koeopf, Pamela A

**Received:** May,05,2010 20:10:50

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I have lived thru much of the legal process of the changing of ORV and pedestrian access for the Cape Hatteras National Seashore. It is with a heavy heart that I read the latest proposal. I find that the Environmental groups that I used to support have resorted to the same old politics practiced by , well politicians.

I see how they twist the facts regarding the bird nesting and ignore the rights and the very survival of the residents of Hatteras and Ocracoke Islands. I am a recently arrived resident but have visited prior to that for years. Every single person that I know that is a beach go'er or beach driver is also a lover and protector of wildlife. But there is such thing as being reasonable.

I find that the environmental groups ideally would cut off all human contact (except of course their own "responsible" selves) to access to the seashore. The proposed plan while it is somewhat of a compromise ignores the economic impact on the islands. The businesses that will be lost and the money that comes in from tourism. I find this appalling.

However the above being said if this is the best they can do then please do it and don't make access even more restrictive. The island I live on (Hatteras ) is being destroyed by the environmentalists not being saved. I can only hope that reason and compromise will be considered although at this late date I think that the proposal is the best that can be done. Please do not close the door to an agreement that is more favorable to both parties, meaning one that better considers the HUMAN residents and businesses as well as the birds.

**Correspondence ID:** 3534    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Purinai, Joseph T

**Received:** May,05,2010 20:44:44

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I purchased a home in Salvo, N.C. in December 2004. The challenges of owning a home in the area are numerous. High property tax values based on real estate values crashing and property tax values remaining the same, high insurance cost, high electricity and maintenance cost. I doubt there are any buyers that purchased on or after 2004 that are not struggling.

I guess the last shoe to fall could be a very restrictive ORV and pedestrian beach access policy. I know many of the conservation groups are focused entirely on the turtles and birds and find it acceptable to completely kill off the tourist industry. Surely there is some solution that balances the jobs and investments many people have in the area with the need to protect the wildlife.

It strikes me as unfair to build a bridge and invite the public down for the last 40 plus years, allow the island to develop over a long period of time and then to suddenly say you screwed up making an investment here. This place is not really for you, you (all people) get no priority on Hatteras Island.

That would be the nail in the coffin for a lot of homeowners that depend on the rental season. I am seeing it already in the spring rentals that are discounted 50% for some weeks to the offseason rate.

Please try to keep Hatteras a special place for people as well as the birds and turtles. Tom Purinai.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3535    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Bowen, Frank  
**Received:** May,05,2010 20:46:59  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** please keep hatteras open,it;s necessary for a beautiful way of life

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3536    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,05,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Mr. Murray,  
It has been brought to the attention of the kiteboarding community that a variety of plans are being considered in response to proposed environmental and ecological concerns. The Outer Banks of North Carolina is a sanctuary for many beach goers, sports enthusiasts, wildlife observers and most importantly, the natural environment. We, as a community, feel that it is important for the environment to be protected and thus understand certain steps may be 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 away 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 wildlife.  
We strongly feel that the Historical, Cultural, and Economic ramifications of the proposed plans have not been adequately addressed by the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) as is required.  
Should the environmental changes impact our communities' sport (as it would in Plans D, E, & F) we would be forced to reconsider our frequent and environmentally friendly utilization of the Outer Banks. Other user groups such as surfers, fishermen, beachcombers, and virtually all other forms of tourism will also be discouraged from visiting Cape Hatteras if beach closures are greatly expanded. This will have a severely negative impact on the local economy and way of life that the residents of Hatteras Island have enjoyed for many generations. It will also take away something that is important to the lives of thousands of people throughout the United States and around the world.  
If people, and especially children, can not experience the environment how are they going to learn to help you protect the environment?  
Kind Regards, Ralph von Brause

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3537    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,05,2010 20:57:12  
**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:** 3538    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Born, Trevor  
**Received:** May,05,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Cape Hatteras National Seashore 1401 National Park Drive Manteo, NC 27954  
May 5, 2010  
Mr. Murray,  
It has been brought to the attention of the kiteboarding community that a variety of plans are being considered in response to proposed environmental and ecological concerns. The Outer Banks of North Carolina is a sanctuary for many beach goers, sports enthusiasts, wildlife observers and most importantly, the natural environment. We, as a community, feel that it is important for the environment to be protected and thus understand certain steps may be 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 away 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 wildlife.  
We strongly feel that the Historical, Cultural, and Economic ramifications of the proposed plans have not been adequately addressed by the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) as is required.  
Should the environmental changes impact our communities' sport (as it would in Plans D, E, & F) we would be forced to reconsider our frequent and environmentally friendly utilization of the Outer Banks. Other user groups such as surfers, fishermen, beachcombers, and virtually all other forms of tourism will also be discouraged from visiting Cape Hatteras if beach closures are greatly expanded. This will have a severely negative impact on the local economy and way of life that the residents of Hatteras Island have enjoyed for many generations. It will also take away something that is important to the lives of thousands of people throughout the United States and around the world.

If people, and especially children, can not experience the environment how are they going to learn to help you protect the environment?  
Thank you, TMB

**Correspondence ID:** 3539    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Davis, Richard V  
**Received:** May,05,2010 21:08:08  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:**

I am a native North Carolinian. Proud to have been born in a state that is rich in "beach" culture. During my childhood, surf fishing was an integral part of my family. Many of my fondest memories are of the many hours spent knee deep in the surf talking with my dad as we waited for a bite. For the past 23 years, I have traveled the world serving my country in the Armed Forces. During those years, I have taken my children to surf fish when ever we were "home" in North Carolina - my children have surf in their blood too. During my service, I always looked forward to the time when I could head out to the beach as often as I wanted - not just when I was home on leave. I dreamt of the joy of taking my grand children to surf fish and making memories with them. I am disappointed that our memories may now only exist on a pier -if any of them exist by that time.  
I fully understand the necessity of protecting rare species. I will not argue the point that such natural resources need to be protected. They too are an integral part of our "beach culture".  
I would ask for people to step back and look at things from a unique perspective - the perspective of family! The concept of "family" and doing things as "a family" is missing from society today. The idea that parents can take their children surf fishing - spend quality time together can't be a bad thing. So many young people today grow up having never done some of the simple things in life - the kind of things that bond a family: camping, fishing, hiking etc... Their childhoods are occupied with tv, computers, gameboys etc.  
It does not take a rocket scientist to see that parental involvement with their children is on the decline in this country - and then we wonder why so many young people get into legal troubles. I'm not saying that beach access will solve these issues - however it is something that a family can enjoy in this area at a reasonable cost. Not everyone can afford to rent a beach condo, stay in hotel or charter a boat. The average family can afford to camp for few days and enjoy the beach. Unfortunately public access to most beaches are now hampered by condo developments - Cape Hatteras National Seashore is now one of the last areas that is not developed!  
I would ask for people to consider heritage. Heritage is a term we hear alot - its used by everyone when it suits their cause - I am no different in that regard. Please bear with me on this issue. Heritage comes in many forms - I say "Yes Sir and Yes Ma'm" because it was how I was raised - its part of my "personal" heritage. Surf fishing on the outer banks is a heritage - not just to the residents of Dare and Hyde counties. Many of us that were born and raised East of I-95 grew up fishing and driving on the outer banks - its our heritage.  
Please note that for the first time I have mentioned "driving" on the beach - I do not want to dwell on that point. Yes, it is important to us - after all, its what we know and what we have done for decades. Those of us that grew up here know the importance of protecting the seashore. Abusing the seashore would be like driving through our families corn fields - counter productive to our goals. ORV access is part of heritage too.  
All I am asking in this debate is for everyone to step back and look at the other side of the coin. I could never personally condone the demand for anyone to "halt" the pursuit of a family oriented past time. I have to keep looking back at an important line in our nations Declaration Of Independence - "the pursuit of happiness". I defended your right to that entitlement for the past 23 years - all I ask in return is for you to allow me the opportunity to enjoy my "pursuit of happiness".  
I'm confident that a rational and equitable solution can be reached if everyone involved would be a little considerate of the other party. The birds, turtles, and fisherman have co-existed for centuries - there is no reason why that can't continue if we just consider each other.

**Correspondence ID:** 3540    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Stefanelli, Vincent  
**Received:** May,05,2010 21:15:46  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:**

the Outer Banks , all of it, is known world-wide as a choice Kite-Surfing location .  
birds are smart creatures and are likely intelligent enough to figure out that the kites are not birds of pray just like the smart birds in Britan who learned to open foil capped milk bottles

**Correspondence ID:** 3541    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,05,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Mr. Murray,

It has been brought to the attention of the kiteboarding community that a variety of plans are being considered in response to proposed environmental and ecological concerns. The Outer Banks of North Carolina is a sanctuary for many beach goers, sports enthusiasts, wildlife observers and most importantly, the natural environment. We, as a community, feel that it is important for the environment to be protected and thus understand certain steps may be 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 away 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 wildlife.  
We strongly feel that the Historical, Cultural, and Economic ramifications of the proposed plans have not been adequately addressed by the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) as is required.  
Should the environmental changes impact our communities' sport (as it would in Plans D, E, & F) we would be forced to reconsider our frequent and environmentally friendly utilization of the Outer Banks. Other user groups such as surfers, fishermen, beachcombers, and virtually all other forms of tourism will also be discouraged from visiting Cape Hatteras if beach closures are greatly expanded. This will have a severely negative impact on the local economy and way of life that the residents of Hatteras Island have enjoyed for many generations. It will also take away something that is important to the lives of thousands of people throughout the United States and around the world.  
If people, and especially children, can not experience the environment how are they going to learn to help you protect the environment?  
Note that I have visited Cape Hatteras 2 times a year for the last three years.  
Kind Regards,  
Ken Tuttle

**Correspondence ID:** 3542    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,05,2010 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 very concerned that the proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras Natl Seashore does not present a balanced approach, nor a conservation ethic toward wildlife. I'm all for people enjoying the seashore and believe that a lot of the enjoyment that Cape

Hatteras seashore offers is based on it's quiet, pristine, natural environment which supports wildlife. Wildlife viewing is an avid activity of many tourists. It is a travesty to think that ORV policy trumps the value and beauty of migrating, wintering and breeding birds and turtles. Please consider a balanced and protective stance-we have lost too many of these special places and they won't come back. Cape Hatteras is special particularly because of the migrating and breeding wildlife.

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

Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones. Thank you for your consideration. Ann Steighner

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3543    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,05,2010 21:27:18  
**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:** 3544    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,05,2010 21:31:44  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Obviously, it is a daunting task to try to develop a plan which will best address the needs and wishes of so many differing interests. I appreciate the efforts in this regard.  
Basically, I have two (2) concerns with the draft plans.  
First, the plans should adhere very strictly to the enabling legislation. Specifically as identified within the documents themselves "...the Seashore's enabling legislation (the Act), Congress established the Seashore in 1937 as a national seashore for the enjoyment and benefit of the people, and to preserve the area. The Act states:  
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 areas 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."  
The key here is that the act clearly distinguishes a difference between those areas of the park that are especially adaptable for recreational use (swimming, boating, fishing, etc.) and directs that these areas should be developed for these uses as needed. Those areas of the park that clearly fit the description of being especially adaptable to these recreational uses are the beaches to the extent necessary to allow full utility of the ocean, sounds, etc. for the described recreational uses.  
It should be clear from this wording that the Act did not intend for the administering body to act in any way to limit these areas to recreational uses and quite to the contrary, directs that these be developed as needed. I would offer that the various ramps and established access points serve these purposes. The point is that this is what the Act intended for these beaches. That is the reason this exception was included within the Act. In short, the Act as written differentiates the beaches from those other areas of the park that are not "..... especially adaptable for recreational uses..."  
The Act intends for the beaches to remain and be developed as needed for recreational uses of similar nature to fishing and swimming. The Act basically directs the preservation of those other areas (those not suitable for recreational use) but even here, the Act provides for the encroachment of these areas as necessary for developing the recreational use of the beaches.  
Any management plan alternative selected for final implementation should not include anything that limits or impedes access to the beaches for these purposes. Whereas vehicular access was already in practice at the time of the passage of the Act, clearly, the Act did not intend that this access be limited and in fact, directs that it be facilitated.  
My second concern is that all alternatives appear to exclude use by ATVs. I believe this is a mistake from a legal and a practical standpoint. Proper and reasonably operated ATVs do much less damage, consume less fuel, emit less contaminants and provide less obstruction than full size ORVs. Their use should be encouraged and not prohibited. I have not seen in the documents that there is an adequate justification for excluding ATVs or for requiring that all vehicles meet "street legal" requirements (license, inspections, registration, etc.) It should not be difficult to conclude that the vehicles accessing the beaches at the time of the Act (1937) would not meet these requirements since most, if not all, were not in effect at that time. Again, we should not be taking actions that serve to further limit or restrict any such access, vehicular or otherwise beyond what was directed in the enabling Act. Excluding a class of vehicles or requiring that all vehicles meet certain prescribed standards without first demonstrating the necessity of such requirements, should be considered arbitrary and capricious.  
I appreciate your consideration of my comments and the the considerable effort that has been put into these documents.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3545    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** warner, dennis m  
**Received:** May,05,2010 21:32:16  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

0009761

**Correspondence:** I do not agree with the name of the DEIS because it is named the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Off-Road Vehicle Negotiated Rulemaking and Management Plan. The DEIS also governs pedestrians which should also be included in the name. This is not just about ORV's but pedestrian use also which many do not know about. Pedestrian use will also be restricted as well as ORV use. The people need to know that the DEIS also restricts pedestrian use along with ORV's.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3546    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Sargent, Cory  
**Received:** May,05,2010 21:49:55

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am an avid surfer/kiteboarder/and Fisherman. I've been coming to Waves, NC. for over a decade to enjoy the beauty and natural resources that the island has to offer. Also, i'm in the process of purchasing land on the island to someday retire on to. While there I always recycle, take great care to respect local laws, and not disturb vegetation or animals. Furthermore, a large portion of my vacation dollars go directly to the local businesses. If access is stopped I will no longer pursue purchasing property on the island nor will I vacation there. Please keep access open and safe for all..... birds, animals, and people.  
Thank You  
Cory Sargent

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3547    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,05,2010 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.  
Whatever plan is adopted, I hope that it would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are 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:** 3548    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Traykovski, Peter  
**Received:** May,05,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Mr. Murray,  
It has been brought to the attention of the kiteboarding community that a variety of plans are being considered in response to proposed environmental and ecological concerns. The Outer Banks of North Carolina is a sanctuary for many beach goers, sports enthusiasts, wildlife observers and most importantly, the natural environment. We, as a community, feel that it is important for the environment to be protected and thus understand certain steps may be 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 away 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 wildlife.  
We strongly feel that the Historical, Cultural, and Economic ramifications of the proposed plans have not been adequately addressed by the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) as is required.  
Should the environmental changes impact our communities' sport (as it would in Plans D, E, & F) we would be forced to reconsider our frequent and environmentally friendly utilization of the Outer Banks. Other user groups such as surfers, fishermen, beachcombers, and virtually all other forms of tourism will also be discouraged from visiting Cape Hatteras if beach closures are greatly expanded. This will have a severely negative impact on the local economy and way of life that the residents of Hatteras Island have enjoyed for many generations. It will also take away something that is important to the lives of thousands of people throughout the United States and around the world.  
If people, and especially children, can not experience the environment how are they going to learn to help you protect the environment?  
The above is form letter I copied and pasted , but fully agree with it's content. As an ex-resident and windsurfing instructor in Salvo and Waves, NC for 4 years (still a frequent vacationer there) and now an oceanographer on the other cape: Cape Cod MA. I am very concerned about unnecessary restrictions on public access to beaches and coastal areas. While obviously off-road vehicle use has to be managed in a reasonable manner for the beaches to be safe for the public not in vehicles and for preservation of wildlife and the environment, placing restrictions on certain activities without a sound scientific basis seems unreasonable. In particular the language about "Any piping plover unfledged chick brood will require a 1,000 meter pedestrian/ORV closure around it in all directions" in alternative F seems like a unreasonable distance for pedestrians that might not be scientifically justifiable.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3549    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Ferrris, James  
**Received:** May,05,2010 22:13:23

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Sir or Madame,  
After reviewing the USPS documentation I would like to say that I am disappointed and wanted to stress my views. I do not believe there are enough pedestrian free paths or walk ways for beach combers or nature lovers.  
As an avid beach lover, walker and birder I think that there should be limited access and paths for people to enjoy the beach without vehicles impeding on our privacy.  
Please insure that we can walk on the beach like years ago thus enjoying the peace, solitude and the sounds of waves crashing on the beach. I would like to walk on the beautiful beaches of the Outer Banks and enjoy the natural sounds, sights and smells of the oceans. I do not want to inhale the smells of vehicle exhaust or worry about a crazed four wheeler speeding down the beach trying to reach his favorite fishing spot before another competitor gets

there first.

As a retired government employee I think that I should be able to enjoy pristine nature in a pure form without having to compete with four wheel drive vehicles cluttering the entire beach.

Please reconsider and remember that the seashore park is for everyone and that walkers should not be forgotten.

Sincerely, James Ferris Retired U.S. DoD employee

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3550    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,05,2010 22:27:28  
**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:** 3551    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,05,2010 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. We ask that any plan that is approved will do the following:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families 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. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for your time and consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3552    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Patton, Todd C  
**Received:** May,05,2010 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. This is one of my family's favorite vacation spots and is easily accessible from the Triangle. But too often, our visits have been ruined by aggressive and obnoxious actions by drivers of off road vehicles.  
Of the 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 ask that any plan that is approved will do the following:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families 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. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3553    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,05,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Mr. Murray,

It has been brought to the attention of the kiteboarding community that a variety of plans are being considered in response to proposed environmental and ecological concerns. The Outer Banks of North Carolina is a sanctuary for many beach goers, sports enthusiasts, wildlife observers and most importantly, the natural environment. We, as a community, feel that it is important for the environment to be protected and thus understand certain steps may be 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 away 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 wildlife.

We strongly feel that the Historical, Cultural, and Economic ramifications of the proposed plans have not been adequately addressed by the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) as is required.

Should the environmental changes impact our communities' sport (as it would in Plans D, E, & F) we would be forced to reconsider our frequent and environmentally friendly utilization of the Outer Banks. Other user groups such as surfers, fishermen, beachcombers, and virtually all other forms of tourism will also be discouraged from visiting Cape Hatteras if beach closures are greatly expanded. This will have a severely negative impact on the local economy and way of life that the residents of Hatteras Island have enjoyed for many generations. It will also take away something that is important to the lives of thousands of people throughout the United States and around the world.

If people, and especially children, can not experience the environment how are they going to learn to help you protect the environment?  
 Kind Regards

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3554    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** c, Peter  
**Received:** May,05,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** please keep access for kite surfing cape hatterass

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3555    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,05,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Mr. Murray,

It has been brought to the attention of the kiteboarding community that a variety of plans are being considered in response to proposed environmental and ecological concerns. The Outer Banks of North Carolina is a sanctuary for many beach goers, sports enthusiasts, wildlife observers and most importantly, the natural environment. We, as a community, feel that it is important for the environment to be protected and thus understand certain steps may be 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 away 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 wildlife.

We strongly feel that the Historical, Cultural, and Economic ramifications of the proposed plans have not been adequately addressed by the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) as is required.

Should the environmental changes impact our communities' sport (as it would in Plans D, E, & F) we would be forced to reconsider our frequent and environmentally friendly utilization of the Outer Banks. Other user groups such as surfers, fishermen, beachcombers, and virtually all other forms of tourism will also be discouraged from visiting Cape Hatteras if beach closures are greatly expanded. This will have a severely negative impact on the local economy and way of life that the residents of Hatteras Island have enjoyed for many generations. It will also take away something that is important to the lives of thousands of people throughout the United States and around the world.

If people, and especially children, can not experience the environment how are they going to learn to help you protect the environment?  
 Kind Regards,  
 Stefano Pietrolucci

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3556    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Steindorfer, Adi  
**Received:** May,05,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Mr. Murray,

It has been brought to the attention of the kiteboarding community that a variety of plans are being considered in response to proposed environmental and ecological concerns. The Outer Banks of North Carolina is a sanctuary for many beach goers, sports enthusiasts, wildlife observers and most importantly, the natural environment. We, as a community, feel that it is important for the environment to be protected and thus understand certain steps may be 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 away 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 wildlife.

We strongly feel that the Historical, Cultural, and Economic ramifications of the proposed plans have not been adequately addressed by the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) as is required.

Should the environmental changes impact our communities' sport (as it would in Plans D, E, & F) we would be forced to reconsider our frequent and environmentally friendly utilization of the Outer Banks. Other user groups such as surfers, fishermen, beachcombers, and virtually all other forms of tourism will also be discouraged from visiting Cape Hatteras if beach closures are greatly expanded. This will have a severely negative impact on the local economy and way of life that the residents of Hatteras Island have enjoyed for many generations. It will also take away something that is important to the lives of thousands of people throughout the United States and around the world.

If people, and especially children, can not experience the environment how are they going to learn to help you protect the environment?  
 Kind Regards,

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3557    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,05,2010 23:27:30

**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:** 3558    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596**Name:** Redman, Robert M**Received:** May.06.2010 00:00:00**Correspondence Type:** Web Form**Correspondence:** Mr. Murray,

I have visited the Outer Banks twice a year for the past 3 years. It is my number one favorite vacation spot, and I make the trek all the way across the country, and spend my vacation dollars in NC when it is cheaper and a faster flight for me to get to Maui or Baja Mexico. These plans will destroy everything I enjoy about OBX. Please reconsider.

I've heard that a variety of plans are being considered in response to proposed environmental and ecological concerns. The Outer Banks of North Carolina is a sanctuary for many beach goers, sports enthusiasts, wildlife observers and most importantly, the natural environment. I feel that it is important for the environment to be protected and thus understand certain steps may be 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 away 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 wildlife.

We strongly feel that the Historical, Cultural, and Economic ramifications of the proposed plans have not been adequately addressed by the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) as is required.

Should the environmental changes impact our communities' sport (as it would in Plans D, E, & F) we would be forced to reconsider our frequent and environmentally friendly utilization of the Outer Banks. Other user groups such as surfers, fishermen, beachcombers, and virtually all other forms of tourism will also be discouraged from visiting Cape Hatteras if beach closures are greatly expanded. This will have a severely negative impact on the local economy and way of life that the residents of Hatteras Island have enjoyed for many generations. It will also take away something that is important to the lives of thousands of people throughout the United States and around the world.

If people, and especially children, can not experience the environment how are they going to learn to help you protect the environment?

Kind Regards, Robert Redman

**Correspondence ID:** 3559    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y**Name:** private**Received:** May.06.2010 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 places in our country for off road vehicles...I feel strongly that our National Parks should be places where wildlife and citizens get a break from motor 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.

I agree with the following criteria which I've read about from the Audubon Society's Action Center.

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

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

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

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

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts 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 Kathleen Hannan 2208 Richard Lane Hillsborough, NC 27278

**Correspondence ID:** 3560    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

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

**Received:** May,06,2010 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.

Any plan must provide equal access for all visitors--the small but extremely vocal ORV group must not be allowed to dominate...only 16 miles for us and wildlife and 68 miles for ORV's is not fair and equitable.

If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families 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. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best 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:** 3561    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** M, Karsten

**Received:** May,06,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Mr. Murray,

It has been brought to the attention of the kiteboarding community that a variety of plans are being considered in response to proposed environmental and ecological concerns. The Outer Banks of North Carolina is a sanctuary for many beach goers, sports enthusiasts, wildlife observers and most importantly, the natural environment. We, as a community, feel that it is important for the environment to be protected and thus understand certain steps may be 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 away 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 wildlife.

We strongly feel that the Historical, Cultural, and Economic ramifications of the proposed plans have not been adequately addressed by the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) as is required.

Should the environmental changes impact our communities' sport (as it would in Plans D, E, & F) we would be forced to reconsider our frequent and environmentally friendly utilization of the Outer Banks. Other user groups such as surfers, fishermen, beachcombers, and virtually all other forms of tourism will also be discouraged from visiting Cape Hatteras if beach closures are greatly expanded. This will have a severely negative impact on the local economy and way of life that the residents of Hatteras Island have enjoyed for many generations. It will also take away something that is important to the lives of thousands of people throughout the United States and around the world.

If people, and especially children, can not experience the environment how are they going to learn to help you protect the environment?

Kind Regards, Karsten

**Correspondence ID:** 3562    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Langner, Chris

**Received:** May,06,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Mr. Murray,

It has been brought to the attention of the kiteboarding community that a variety of plans are being considered in response to proposed environmental and ecological concerns. The Outer Banks of North Carolina is a sanctuary for many beach goers, sports enthusiasts, wildlife observers and most importantly, the natural environment. We, as a community, feel that it is important for the environment to be protected and thus understand certain steps may be 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 away 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 wildlife.

We strongly feel that the Historical, Cultural, and Economic ramifications of the proposed plans have not been adequately addressed by the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) as is required.

Should the environmental changes impact our communities' sport (as it would in Plans D, E, & F) we would be forced to reconsider our frequent and environmentally friendly utilization of the Outer Banks. Other user groups such as surfers, fishermen, beachcombers, and virtually all other forms of tourism will also be discouraged from visiting Cape Hatteras if beach closures are greatly expanded. This will have a severely negative impact on the local economy and way of life that the residents of Hatteras Island have enjoyed for many generations. It will also take away something that is important to the lives of thousands of people throughout the United States and around the world.

If people, and especially children, can not experience the environment how are they going to learn to help you protect the environment?

Kind Regards,

Chris Langner

**Correspondence ID:** 3563    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 01:11:42

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Sir/Madam,

I believe from the kitesurfing community that a ban is being considered to access on the outer banks of the North Carolina.

From my experience of being involved with Surfers against Sewage here in the UK there is no doubt that the best results in keeping our beaches clean has been achieved through education and encouraging people to enjoy our waters in a considered manner.

Whilst places of natural beauty deserve special consideration keeping people away does not encourage the populace to consider the consequences of our collective polluting.

I sincerely hope you can find a solution that protects the environment without unnecessary restrictions.

Yours Sincerely,

Gary Hand

**Correspondence ID:** 3564    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.06,2010 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.  
 It seems reasonable that our national parks should favor those visitors whose interest is foremost experiencing the park itself. ORV users inherently are not in that category; as they value they obviously value the experience of their vehicles more highly than the tranquil surroundings they're buzzing through.  
 The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
 \*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
 \* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
 \* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3565    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.06,2010 01:50:48  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Mr. Murray,  
 I have visited the outer banks since I was an exchange student in North Carolina in 1995. I was coming back regularly, since the landscape and environment is outstanding and not to be found anywhere else, that I know of.  
 It has been brought to my attention that a variety of plans are being considered in response to proposed environmental and ecological concerns. The Outer Banks of North Carolina is a sanctuary for many beach goers, sports enthusiasts, wildlife observers and most importantly, the natural environment. We, as a community, feel that it is important for the environment to be protected and thus understand certain steps may be 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 away 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 wildlife.  
 We strongly feel that the Historical, Cultural, and Economic ramifications of the proposed plans have not been adequately addressed by the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) as is required.  
 Should the environmental changes impact our communities' sport (as it would in Plans D, E, & F) we would be forced to reconsider our frequent and environmentally friendly utilization of the Outer Banks. Other user groups such as surfers, fishermen, beachcombers, and virtually all other forms of tourism will also be discouraged from visiting Cape Hatteras if beach closures are greatly expanded. This will have a severely negative impact on the local economy and way of life that the residents of Hatteras Island have enjoyed for many generations. It will also take away something that is important to the lives of thousands of people throughout the United States and around the world.  
 If people, and especially children, can not experience the environment how are they going to learn to help you protect the environment?  
 Kind Regards,  
 Claas Kauenhoven

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3566    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.06,2010 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 work on the Georgia coast with sea turtle conservation. I patrol the beach every morning to look for sea turtle nests and monitor hatching success. I often see nesting shorebirds and their tiny chicks and can't help thinking that we should help protect their habitat, which is decreasing with more development along the coast.  
 This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
 The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
 \*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
 \* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
 \* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well

as breeding ones.

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3567    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.06,2010 02:57:55  
**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:** 3568    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.06,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** It has been brought to the attention of the kiteboarding community that a variety of plans are being considered in response to proposed environmental and ecological concerns. The Outer Banks of North Carolina is a sanctuary for many beach goers, sports enthusiasts, wildlife observers and most importantly, the natural environment. We, as a community, feel that it is important for the environment to be protected and thus understand certain steps may be 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 away 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 wildlife.  
We strongly feel that the Historical, Cultural, and Economic ramifications of the proposed plans have not been adequately addressed by the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) as is required.  
Should the environmental changes impact our communities?? sport (as it would in Plans D, E, & F) we would be forced to reconsider our frequent and environmentally friendly utilization of the Outer Banks. Other user groups such as surfers, fishermen, beachcombers, and virtually all other forms of tourism will also be discouraged from visiting Cape Hatteras if beach closures are greatly expanded. This will have a severely negative impact on the local economy and way of life that the residents of Hatteras Island have enjoyed for many generations. It will also take away something that is important to the lives of thousands of people throughout the United States and around the world.  
If people, and especially children, can not experience the environment how are they going to learn to help you protect the environment?  
Kind Regards,

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3569    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Gupton, William  
**Received:** May.06,2010 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. We ask that any plan that is approved will do the following:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families 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. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3570    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** May.06,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Mr. Murray,

It has been brought to the attention of the kiteboarding community that a variety of plans are being considered in response to proposed environmental and ecological concerns. The Outer Banks of North Carolina is a sanctuary for many beach goers, sports enthusiasts, wildlife observers and most importantly, the natural environment. We, as a community, feel that it is important for the environment to be protected and thus understand certain steps may be 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 away 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 wildlife.

We strongly feel that the Historical, Cultural, and Economic ramifications of the proposed plans have not been adequately addressed by the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) as is required.

Should the environmental changes impact our communities' sport (as it would in Plans D, E, & F) we would be forced to reconsider our frequent and environmentally friendly utilization of the Outer Banks. Other user groups such as surfers, fishermen, beachcombers, and virtually all other forms of tourism will also be discouraged from visiting Cape Hatteras if beach closures are greatly expanded. This will have a severely negative impact on the local economy and way of life that the residents of Hatteras Island have enjoyed for many generations. It will also take away something that is important to the lives of thousands of people throughout the United States and around the world.

If people, and especially children, can not experience the environment how are they going to learn to help you protect the environment?

Kind Regards,  
Geoff C

**Correspondence ID:** 3571    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Fuller, Warren E

**Received:** May.06.2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** While I didn't write the following comment, I wholeheartedly agree with it and wish to enter that I support the arguments that it addresses:

===== It has been brought to the attention of the kiteboarding community that a variety of plans are being considered in response to proposed environmental and ecological concerns. The Outer Banks of North Carolina is a sanctuary for many beach goers, sports enthusiasts, wildlife observers and most importantly, the natural environment. We, as a community, feel that it is important for the environment to be protected and thus understand certain steps may be 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 away 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 wildlife.

We strongly feel that the Historical, Cultural, and Economic ramifications of the proposed plans have not been adequately addressed by the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) as is required.

Should the environmental changes impact our communities' sport (as it would in Plans D, E, & F) we would be forced to reconsider our frequent and environmentally friendly utilization of the Outer Banks. Other user groups such as surfers, fishermen, beachcombers, and virtually all other forms of tourism will also be discouraged from visiting Cape Hatteras if beach closures are greatly expanded. This will have a severely negative impact on the local economy and way of life that the residents of Hatteras Island have enjoyed for many generations. It will also take away something that is important to the lives of thousands of people throughout the United States and around the world.

If people, and especially children, can not experience the environment how are they going to learn to help you protect the environment?

===== I run a website and forum that averages over 300 unique visits on a daily basis and a large part of my visitors visit the Outer Banks regularly.  
Kind Regards, Warren E. Fuller

**Correspondence ID:** 3572    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May.06.2010 04:28:08

**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:** 3573    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May.06.2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Mr. Murray,

It has been brought to the attention of the kiteboarding community that a variety of plans are being considered in response to proposed environmental and ecological concerns. The Outer Banks of North Carolina is a sanctuary for many beach goers, sports enthusiasts, wildlife observers and most importantly, the natural environment. We, as a community, feel that it is important for the environment to be protected and thus understand certain steps

may be 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 away 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 wildlife.

We strongly feel that the Historical, Cultural, and Economic ramifications of the proposed plans have not been adequately addressed by the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) as is required.

Should the environmental changes impact our communities' sport (as it would in Plans D, E, & F) we would be forced to reconsider our frequent and environmentally friendly utilization of the Outer Banks. Other user groups such as surfers, fishermen, beachcombers, and virtually all other forms of tourism will also be discouraged from visiting Cape Hatteras if beach closures are greatly expanded. This will have a severely negative impact on the local economy and way of life that the residents of Hatteras Island have enjoyed for many generations. It will also take away something that is important to the lives of thousands of people throughout the United States and around the world.

If people, and especially children, can not experience the environment how are they going to learn to help you protect the environment?

Kind Regards,

**Correspondence ID:** 3574    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** jefferson, mark d  
**Received:** May,06,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Mr. Murray,

It has been brought to the attention of the kiteboarding community that a variety of plans are being considered in response to proposed environmental and ecological concerns. The Outer Banks of North Carolina is a sanctuary for many beach goers, sports enthusiasts, wildlife observers and most importantly, the natural environment. We, as a community, feel that it is important for the environment to be protected and thus understand certain steps may be 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 away 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 wildlife.

We strongly feel that the Historical, Cultural, and Economic ramifications of the proposed plans have not been adequately addressed by the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) as is required.

Should the environmental changes impact our communities' sport (as it would in Plans D, E, & F) we would be forced to reconsider our frequent and environmentally friendly utilization of the Outer Banks. Other user groups such as surfers, fishermen, beachcombers, and virtually all other forms of tourism will also be discouraged from visiting Cape Hatteras if beach closures are greatly expanded. This will have a severely negative impact on the local economy and way of life that the residents of Hatteras Island have enjoyed for many generations. It will also take away something that is important to the lives of thousands of people throughout the United States and around the world.

If people, and especially children, can not experience the environment how are they going to learn to help you protect the environment?

Kind Regards, Mark Jefferson

**Correspondence ID:** 3575    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 05:31:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:**

As a long time supporter of environmental initiatives with decades of volunteer hours in the field working with the Audubon Society and other environmental groups I am very distressed. The obtuse, inconsiderate actions of the Audubon Society threaten to wipe out a way of life and a community that has thrived for years in coexistence with the natural environment. To be sure there are environmental needs that can and should be met. Increased human activity may require steps to seasonally limit some access to some areas. But preservation efforts need not be applied to the exclusion of all other considerations. It is possible to find solutions that do not exclude recreational activities while still providing the necessary protections for wildlife species. Adaptive management plans can be and have been proven flexible and successful in many areas where humans are in close proximity to wildlife. There is a term for what the Audubon and other environmental groups are. They are called 100%ers. They are driven to achieve by any means possible the complete removal of human influence wherever they can. These latest efforts are just a step in the process of removing the human element from the natural environment. This problem is not limited to the Hatteras National Seashore area. It is a concerted national and international effort by the Audubon. They have a history of twisting the data, misrepresenting the science and cherry picking the available information to suit their agenda. A case in point would be the Red Knot. In Florida the Audubon has told city governments that the Red Knot is an endangered species on the brink of extinction. They used this argument to intimidate city governments and organizations and to drum up support of their efforts. Special committees often seated with Audubon representatives and supporters attempt to make legislative decisions outside of the legislative process. They attempt to force a singular, private agenda based on poor science and emotional arguments and lies. However, the Red Knot is not classified as endangered or even threatened. A quick check on the internet can yield the truth. They have threatened Florida municipalities with egregiously inaccurate interpretations of the Migratory Bird Act. In short its another lie. This is a very complicated and polarizing issue with extremist views on both sides. The truth and solutions lie somewhere in the middle and I hope that policy makers will have the decency to support the people by taking the time to completely evaluate ALL the information and verify it before making decisions based on skewed, misrepresented facts, emotional arguments and lies.

**Correspondence ID:** 3576    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Aimone, James  
**Received:** May,06,2010 05:38:20  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:**

As Woody Guthrie sang.... "This Land is your Land, this Land is my land from the New York harbor to the Outer Banks Islands.....this land was made for You and ME!

He wasn't singing about the piping plovers or the Audobon society. It's important that we keep these precious areas proctected, but accesible for EVERYone to enjoy. That future children will enjoy and appreciate these treasured places.

We can not let one speacial interest group take control and dominate there veiw over everyone else, just because they more power and money money than the other voices.

Please keep the Hatteras beaches open for all to enjoy. Of course we need to do this in a responsible manner to ensure this natural resource is around for many generations to come.

Thanks for listening..

James Aimone Plymouth MA.

"This Land is your Land, this Land is my land from the New York harbor to the Outer Banks Islands.....this land was made for You and ME!

**Correspondence ID:** 3577    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Shutt, Judson H  
**Received:** May.06,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** To Wom it May Concern: It has been brought to the attention of the kiteboarding community that a variety of plans are being considered in response to proposed environmental and ecological concerns. The Outer Banks of North Carolina is a sanctuary for many beach goers, sports enthusiasts, wildlife observers and most importantly, the natural environment. We, as a community, feel that it is important for the environment to be protected and thus understand certain steps may be 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 away 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 wildlife.  
 We strongly feel that the Historical, Cultural, and Economic ramifications of the proposed plans have not been adequately addressed by the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) as is required.  
 Should the environmental changes impact our communities' sport (as it would in Plans D, E, & F) we would be forced to reconsider our frequent and environmentally friendly utilization of the Outer Banks. Other user groups such as surfers, fishermen, beachcombers, and virtually all other forms of tourism will also be discouraged from visiting Cape Hatteras if beach closures are greatly expanded. This will have a severely negative impact on the local economy and way of life that the residents of Hatteras Island have enjoyed for many generations. It will also take away something that is important to the lives of thousands of people throughout the United States and around the world.  
 If people, and especially children, can not experience the environment how are they going to learn to help you protect the environment?  
 Thank you. Judson H. Shutt

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3578    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Walsh, Kenneth E  
**Received:** May.06,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Mr. Murray,  
 It has been brought to the attention of the kiteboarding community that a variety of plans are being considered in response to proposed environmental and ecological concerns. The Outer Banks of North Carolina is a sanctuary for many beach goers, sports enthusiasts, wildlife observers and most importantly, the natural environment. We, as a community, feel that it is important for the environment to be protected and thus understand certain steps may be 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 away 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 wildlife.  
 We strongly feel that the Historical, Cultural, and Economic ramifications of the proposed plans have not been adequately addressed by the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) as is required.  
 Should the environmental changes impact our communities' sport (as it would in Plans D, E, & F) we would be forced to reconsider our frequent and environmentally friendly utilization of the Outer Banks. Other user groups such as surfers, fishermen, beachcombers, and virtually all other forms of tourism will also be discouraged from visiting Cape Hatteras if beach closures are greatly expanded. This will have a severely negative impact on the local economy and way of life that the residents of Hatteras Island have enjoyed for many generations. It will also take away something that is important to the lives of thousands of people throughout the United States and around the world.  
 If people, and especially children, can not experience the environment how are they going to learn to help you protect the environment?  
 Kind Regards,  
 Ken Walsh

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3579    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.06,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Mr. Murray,  
 It has been brought to the attention of the kiteboarding community that a variety of plans are being considered in response to proposed environmental and ecological concerns. The Outer Banks of North Carolina is a sanctuary for many beach goers, sports enthusiasts, wildlife observers and most importantly, the natural environment. We, as a community, feel that it is important for the environment to be protected and thus understand certain steps may be 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 away 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 wildlife.  
 We strongly feel that the Historical, Cultural, and Economic ramifications of the proposed plans have not been adequately addressed by the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) as is required.  
 Should the environmental changes impact our communities' sport (as it would in Plans D, E, & F) we would be forced to reconsider our frequent and environmentally friendly utilization of the Outer Banks. Other user groups such as surfers, fishermen, beachcombers, and virtually all other forms of tourism will also be discouraged from visiting Cape Hatteras if beach closures are greatly expanded. This will have a severely negative impact on the local economy and way of life that the residents of Hatteras Island have enjoyed for many generations. It will also take away something that is important to the lives of thousands of people throughout the United States and around the world.  
 If people, and especially children, can not experience the environment how are they going to learn to help you protect the environment?  
 Kind Regards,  
 Thomas Lowe Frequent Visitor

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3580    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.06,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As a frequent traveler/kiteboarder (2 or 3 one week trips annually for kiteboarding) to the Outer Banks I fully support the points made in the following text:  
 It has been brought to the attention of the kiteboarding community that a variety of plans are being considered in response to proposed environmental and ecological concerns. The Outer Banks of North Carolina is a sanctuary for many beach goers, sports enthusiasts, wildlife observers and most importantly, the natural environment. We, as a community, feel that it is important for the environment to be protected and thus understand certain steps

may be 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 away 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 wildlife.

We strongly feel that the Historical, Cultural, and Economic ramifications of the proposed plans have not been adequately addressed by the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) as is required.

Should the environmental changes impact our communities' sport (as it would in Plans D, E, & F) we would be forced to reconsider our frequent and environmentally friendly utilization of the Outer Banks. Other user groups such as surfers, fishermen, beachcombers, and virtually all other forms of tourism will also be discouraged from visiting Cape Hatteras if beach closures are greatly expanded. This will have a severely negative impact on the local economy and way of life that the residents of Hatteras Island have enjoyed for many generations. It will also take away something that is important to the lives of thousands of people throughout the United States and around the world.

If people, and especially children, can not experience the environment how are they going to learn to help you protect the environment?

Thanks....Vic Gubinski

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3581    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Self, Michael M  
**Received:** May,06,2010 06:27:44  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Gentlemen/Ladies. I first visited the Outer Banks as a child in 1952; as an adult my family and I have been visiting Ocracoke Island almost annually since 1974; we've been property owners there since 1979. Back in the 70's hardly anyone outside the Carolinas and Virginia had ever heard of the Outer Banks; of course that's changed?even here in Ohio hardly a day goes by that I don't see a car sporting an OBX sticker. Of course that means more people are visiting the Banks; since they come for fishing and the beach, there are far more folks on the shoreline than there used to be.  
Long before the Cape Hatteras National Seashore was established, driving on the beach was the only way to get around. On Ocracoke, for example, driving to the village from the Hatteras ferry landing could only be accomplished at low tide; the "road" was the beach. Even today pedestrian access to Ocracoke's 14 miles of beach is only possible at four sites. Thus vehicular beach access afforded by the ramps is a truly unique aspect of the Seashore. It allows both residents and visitors to experience the quiet and solitude of their "own" little stretch of beach, or the camaraderie of getting together with friends for a day at the beach. You're proposing to do away with?or drastically restrict this access?with very little hard data on environmental damage to support your proposals. Consider the following:  
1. When the National Seashore was created, privately owned property in the villages and a state highway traversing the park were allowed to remain. If the park was created to serve strictly as a wildlife refuge with extensive access restrictions, why wasn't all private property purchased, the roads removed and access restricted as it is on the Core and Shackleford Banks? Had the access restrictions you're proposing been announced at the Park's creation, I'd wager there would have been a huge outcry from residents and visitors alike?perhaps enough to prevent the park's creation. 2. Drastically restricting access to not only vehicles but even pedestrians significantly diminishes the allure of the park for visitors. It is, after all a National Seashore; if visitors are restricted to a constantly changing and ever shrinking shore access, why should they bother to come?  
3. What of the residents? They live in the Outer Banks villages either because they enjoy the ambience, because their families have lived there for generations or because they own or work at businesses along the Banks. Your proposals will negatively alter their lives?and livelihood.  
4. Drastic restrictions on beach access affect me?and many others--as property owners. Fewer visitors mean fewer cottage renters and diminished property values, but the expenses continue regardless. Then consider those whose livelihood depends on visitors?mostly in the summer when your proposed access restrictions are the greatest. A quick check with the Chambers of Commerce in both Hyde and Dare counties will show you what percentage of revenue is generated by tourism. It's number one.  
A minute's work with a chart and some calipers indicate there are over 50 miles of beach on the Core Banks and Shackleford Banks, stretching from Portsmouth Island on the north beyond Cape Lookout to Beaufort on the south. These islands are uninhabited, have little or no vehicle access, and are rarely visited even by pedestrians as they're only accessible by boat and three pedestrian ferries. Since they comprise the Cape Lookout National Seashore, why not concentrate these intensive conservation efforts and access restrictions there? The Core and Shackleford Banks provides the same wildlife environment as the Outer Banks and already have highly restricted access, both by design and location.  
Finally, please remember that National Parks and Seashores were created for the American public to use and enjoy?the same American public whose taxes paid for their creation, and whose taxes continue to pay for their maintenance and staffing. Wildlife conservation is an important part of our National Parks system, but not the only component. Enjoyment of the parks by the public is the other component; the balance between the two is sadly lacking in your proposals for Hatteras National Seashore?especially when you consider the next 50 miles of already dedicated, uninhabited and nearly inaccessible Cape Lookout National Seashore to the south.  
Don't fall into the "nature good; people bad" trap. For the fifty plus years the Hatteras National Seashore has been in existence, generations of responsible visitors have respected the wildlife, dunes and other natural features while enjoying vehicular and pedestrian access to the beaches. Do you have so little faith in the American public to think they won't continue to do so?  
Michael M. Self Ocracoke property owner & Outer Banks visitor since 1952

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3582    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 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. Thank you. I look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3583    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Drebushenko, Lisa  
**Received:** May,06,2010 06:36:17  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am writing in response to the on going discussion about an ORV plan on the Hatteras National Seashore area. It is very unfortunate that it has come to this to have a resolution on the ORV use on the island. I agree that something should be done to manage this area. I have been going to this area for vacation for 35 years and I have seen destruction which is done by people, animals and vehicles. BUT it is not at the point that the laws have to totally cut the people and animals out of the beaches. Why is it when we do something it is either not enough or it is way too much?  
My husband and I purchased a house in Avon about ten years ago. We rent the property so that we can afford to keep it. We do not charge a huge amount because our main purpose is to share the beauty of the area with other people. Part of that beauty is the fact that you can drive on the beaches - or walk wherever you want to without worry. The wildlife too is a large part of that beauty. The problem with all the beauty is that it attracts more people - with more people comes more problems. No matter where you live whether it is at the seashore or in the woods there are always people that will ruin it for others. What I do not understand is how a government agency can take away a freedom. I can understand trying to watch the area more closely or maybe a limit on the number of vehicles per day and even blocking off areas that have bedding going on - but not totally closing off areas to

people. If I understand correctly - this area is National Seashore. Natinoal to me means that it is owned by the American people. As is the Park Service and actually all the government agencies. Because that is the case then maybe there should be a half way meeting ground. If you come in there and tell us what we can and cannot do then what type of governing is that? I do not have the answers on how to correct the problem - but I do know that what you propose is just going to cause more problems in the Outer Banks. Sice I have been going down there - there has been no love lost between the people that live there and the Park Service. Because I do not live there I do not know the whole story, but this whole situation is making it worse. I do know that the park service is always complaining that there is no money to implement programs. Why not charge a fee for vehicles to drive on the beach? Why not have a booth and a gate at each of the entrances to the beach and limit the number of vehicles that can go on in a period of time? (Like they do up at Assateague?) Charge either a daily rate or a weekly or seasonal rate. The people that live there would be either exempt or at a low rate. As for those that are destroying the nests - they are idiots. We have seen kids driving on the beach so fast they would kill anything if it was hit. We have had college kis have fires on the beach in front of our house and have smashed bottles and left it burning the next day. Maybe there should be more fines that are actually given - maybe if the punishments for committing the crimes were actually given maybe it sould discourage people from doin them. We have cleaned up other people's messes many times. Maybe you should have a special clean up weekend and have different groups come and clean up the beaches. Again I do not know the answers, but I do know that if you take away everything all you are doing is making a bad situation worse. PLEASE PLEASE reconsider your proposal and re do it again. Please protect the beauty and wildlife in the area. It is an important place for alot of animals that are disappearing. It needs to be taken care of and preserved. This time try to take in account what the people that actually live there are saying - also ask the property owners what they think and also ask the people that use the land there what they think. Ask for some help and suggestions from the public and you may get some new ides on what to do. Maybe then you can get a clearer idea on how to handle the problem.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3584    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Mr. Murray,

It has been brought to the attention of the kiteboarding community that a variety of plans are being considered in response to proposed environmental and ecological concerns. The Outer Banks of North Carolina is a sanctuary for many beach goers, sports enthusiasts, wildlife observers and most importantly, the natural environment. We, as a community, feel that it is important for the environment to be protected and thus understand certain steps may be 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 away 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 wildlife.

We strongly feel that the Historical, Cultural, and Economic ramifications of the proposed plans have not been adequately addressed by the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) as is required.

Should the environmental changes impact our communities' sport (as it would in Plans D, E, & F) we would be forced to reconsider our frequent and environmentally friendly utilization of the Outer Banks. Other user groups such as surfers, fishermen, beachcombers, and virtually all other forms of tourism will also be discouraged from visiting Cape Hatteras if beach closures are greatly expanded. This will have a severely negative impact on the local economy and way of life that the residents of Hatteras Island have enjoyed for many generations. It will also take away something that is important to the lives of thousands of people throughout the United States and around the world.

If people, and especially children, can not experience the environment how are they going to learn to help you protect the environment?

Kind Regards, Richard B Councill

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3585    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Mr. Murray,

It has been brought to the attention of the kiteboarding community that a variety of plans are being considered in response to proposed environmental and ecological concerns. The Outer Banks of North Carolina is a sanctuary for many beach goers, sports enthusiasts, wildlife observers and most importantly, the natural environment. We, as a community, feel that it is important for the environment to be protected and thus understand certain steps may be 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 away 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 wildlife.

We strongly feel that the Historical, Cultural, and Economic ramifications of the proposed plans have not been adequately addressed by the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) as is required.

Should the environmental changes impact our communities' sport (as it would in Plans D, E, & F) we would be forced to reconsider our frequent and environmentally friendly utilization of the Outer Banks. Other user groups such as surfers, fishermen, beachcombers, and virtually all other forms of tourism will also be discouraged from visiting Cape Hatteras if beach closures are greatly expanded. This will have a severely negative impact on the local economy and way of life that the residents of Hatteras Island have enjoyed for many generations. It will also take away something that is important to the lives of thousands of people throughout the United States and around the world.

If people, and especially children, can not experience the environment how are they going to learn to help you protect the environment?

Kind Regards,

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3586    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 06:58:22

**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.

National Park Service

I am a complete fan of our country's shore birds and other marine life such as sea turtles. I also spend time at Cape Hatteras every summer, and wish to see the resources and wildlife there (as well as everywhere) preserved.

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

0009773

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3587    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 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 use of off-road vehicles on the beach is incompatible both with wildlife and with the enjoyment of other visitors. Limiting ORV use on the beach thus protects both animals and visitors from the noise and destruction these vehicles cause. It should be noted that ORV users are a small, but vocal minority among those of us who enjoy our national parks. Most of us go to the parks to get away from vehicles!  
Another point I think you should consider is the health of the US public. Our government should be encouraging physical activity to reduce the burden of epidemic chronic conditions such as obesity and diabetes. Rather than allowing vehicles on the beach, the park might invest in people-friendly infrastructure, such as trails and rest stops with shade, water, and bathroom facilities.  
I fully support the park's formulation a plan with the following principles, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3588    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Mr. Murray,  
It has been brought to the attention of the kiteboarding community that a variety of plans are being considered in response to proposed environmental and ecological concerns. The Outer Banks of North Carolina is a sanctuary for many beach goers, sports enthusiasts, wildlife observers and most importantly, the natural environment. We, as a community, feel that it is important for the environment to be protected and thus understand certain steps may be 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 away 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 wildlife.  
We strongly feel that the Historical, Cultural, and Economic ramifications of the proposed plans have not been adequately addressed by the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) as is required.  
Should the environmental changes impact our communities' sport (as it would in Plans D, E, & F) we would be forced to reconsider our frequent and environmentally friendly utilization of the Outer Banks. Other user groups such as surfers, fishermen, beachcombers, and virtually all other forms of tourism will also be discouraged from visiting Cape Hatteras if beach closures are greatly expanded. This will have a severely negative impact on the local economy and way of life that the residents of Hatteras Island have enjoyed for many generations. It will also take away something that is important to the lives of thousands of people throughout the United States and around the world.  
If people, and especially children, can not experience the environment how are they going to learn to help you protect the environment?  
Kind Regards,  
Mrs. Blakaitis

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3589    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Chatham, Alexander  
**Received:** May,06,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am a resident of North Carolina who enjoys recreational opportunities offered by the Cape Hatteras National Seashore and Recreational Area. Reasonable and safe pedestrian and vehicular access to the beach is essential to participate and enjoy these resources and opportunities. I also support restrictions and conditions necessary to protect the birds, sea turtles, and other biota that are supported by scientific data and can make the Seashore home for part of the year. I believe the favored alternative (#7) advanced by the NPS is more restrictive than necessary to meet protection of the Seashore. I have read and agree with the proposal to manage ORV's on the Seashore prepared and submitted for consideration by the Coalition for Beach Access. My position is that the NPS accept this alternative or at least postpone a final decision on the ORV Plan pending further review and negotiation on the counter points raised by the Coalition for Beach Access.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3590    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** May,06,2010 07:00:06  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** "I am a resident of North Carolina who enjoys recreational opportunities offered by the Cape Hatteras National Seashore and Recreational Area. Reasonable and safe pedestrian and vehicular access to the beach is essential to participate and enjoy these resources and opportunities. I also support restrictions and conditions necessary to protect the birds, sea turtles, and other biota that are supported by scientific data and can make the Seashore home for part of the year. I believe the favor alternative (#7) advanced by the NPS is more restrictive than necessary to meet protection of the Seashore. I have read and agree with the proposal to manage ORV's on the Seashore prepared and submitted for consideration by the Coalition for Beach Access.

My position is that the NPS accept this alternative or at least postpone a final decision on the ORV Plan pending further review and negotiation on the counter points raised by the Coalition for Beach Access."

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3591	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,06,2010 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Mr. Murray, It has been brought to the attention of the kiteboarding community that a variety of plans are being considered in response to proposed environmental and ecological concerns. The Outer Banks of North Carolina is a sanctuary for many beach goers, sports enthusiasts, wildlife observers and most importantly, the natural environment. We, as a community, feel that it is important for the environment to be protected and thus understand certain steps may be 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 Statesb?? National Parks. Closing extensive sections of beaches, the sound, and water ways will strip away 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 wildlife. We strongly feel that the Historical, Cultural, and Economic ramifications of the proposed plans have not been adequately addressed by the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) as is required. Should the environmental changes impact our communitiesb?? sport (as it would in Plans D, E, & F) we would be forced to reconsider our frequent and environmentally friendly utilization of the Outer Banks. Other user groups such as surfers, fishermen, beachcombers, and virtually all other forms of tourism will also be discouraged from visiting Cape Hatteras if beach closures are greatly expanded. This will have a severely negative impact on the local economy and way of life that the residents of Hatteras Island have enjoyed for many generations. It will also take away something that is important to the lives of thousands of people throughout the United States and around the world. If people, and especially children, can not experience the environment how are they going to learn to help you protect the environment? Kind Regards, Chad Christy						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3592	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,06,2010 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I am a resident of North Carolina who enjoys recreational opportunities offered by the Cape Hatteras National Seashore and Recreational Area. Reasonable and safe pedestrian and vehicular access to the beach is essential to participate and enjoy these resources and opportunities. I also support restrictions and conditions necessary to protect the birds, sea turtles, and other biota that are supported by scientific data and can make the Seashore home for part of the year. I believe the favor alternative (#7) advanced by the NPS is more restrictive than necessary to meet protection of the Seashore. I have read and agree with the proposal to manage ORV's on the Seashore prepared and submitted for consideration by the Coalition for Beach Access. My position is that the NPS accept this alternative or at least postpone a final decision on the ORV Plan pending further review and negotiation on the counter points raised by the Coalition for Beach Access. As a fisherman and beach comber, I love Cape Hatteras National Seashore and many of the other Outer Banks areas in North Carolina. We have a unique and beautiful area that we can responsibly use and take advantage of the opportunities it provides. While I can see the need for some management of the area, many of the proposals are far too restrictive. If managed responsibly, the needs of all interested parties can be met. Closing off entire sections of beach to all traffic including pedestrian is overkill. A careful pedestrian poses no risk to wildlife on the seashore. The beach should be shared and enjoyed by all.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3593	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,06,2010 07:12:51						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please do not implement any plans containing off limits areas around found nesting sights. Doing so inadvertently creates an adversarial relationship between property owners and beach users that will encourage mismanagement of hatcherys rather than presurvation.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3594	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,06,2010 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I am a resident of Illinois and am a member of the Cape Hatteras Anglers Club in Buxton, North Carolina. I enjoy recreational opportunities offered by the Cape Hatteras National Seashore and Recreational Area and have been coming there for vacations multiple times per year for 30 years. Reasonable and safe pedestrian and vehicular access to the beach is an essential part of what my family enjoys as we partake in the wonderful public resource this area provides. I support restrictions and conditions necessary to protect the birds, sea turtles, and other biota that make the Seashore home for part of the year, provided that the restrictions are supported by scientific data. I believe the NPS favored alternative (F) is much more restrictive than necessary to protect the Seashore. I have read and agree with the proposal to manage ORV's on the Seashore prepared and submitted for consideration by the Coalition for Beach Access; the Coalition for Beach Access - Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area ORV Access Environmental Impact Position Statement. My position is that the NPS accept this alternative or at least postpone a final decision on the ORV Plan pending further review and negotiation on the counter points raised by the Coalition for Beach Access.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3595	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	BreauX, Allison L						
<b>Received:</b>	May,06,2010 07:20:15						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Alternative A is a reasonable balance off the necessary conservation efforts and public access to Hatteras Island beaches. I fully support protecting wildlife, but going to far does more harm than good. Public support is critical to success of conservation efforts and a balanced approach that still allows access to the beaches will be the best way to protect and have public support. Thank you for all of you time and hard work on this project. ~ Ali						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3596	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	Newman, Kenneth A						
<b>Received:</b>	May,06,2010 07:25:53						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						

0009775

**Correspondence:** I strongly opposed the draconian draft rules for the future management of the North Carolina Coast (Cape Hatt Seashore). The beaches were preserved by our forefathers in hopes to SHARE THEM with all Americans. I strongly believe that special interests are taking away the God given rights of the citizens at-large.  
I request that the draft rule as stated be revised to allow more access - NOT LESS - for all AMERICANS.  
We can do better than this. Let us not lose more freedoms.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3597    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Mullen, Judy  
**Received:** May.06.2010 07:33:51  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Free and open beaches. That was the original plan for this, the promise that was made to our area. That promise should be kept.  
The area grew for recreational use. No factories or businesses pollute. You can see stars so bright in the evening. This is because for the most part the people respect what we have and we truly want to preserve our way of living.  
By shutting down the beaches you are taking the lively hood of the residents away. We will become an island of boarded up homes and people on welfare.  
Please think about the people you are hurting.  
Thank you

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3598    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.06.2010 07:40:49  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** My son suffers with Muscular Dystrophy. He has always LOVED the beach, and, of course, his handicap has limited his ability to get on the beach to enjoy it. I purposely bought an SUV to help him, and it's been a real treat for him to be driven close to the water to gain access. Please don't limit our ability to enjoy the beaches of the Outer Banks as a family.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3599    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Weber, Philip  
**Received:** May.06.2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Mike Murray, Superintendent Cape Hatteras National Seashore 1401 National Park Drive Manteo, NC 27954  
May 6, 2010  
Mr. Murray,  
It has been brought to the attention of the kiteboarding community that a variety of plans are being considered in response to proposed environmental and ecological concerns. The Outer Banks of North Carolina is a sanctuary for many beach goers, sports enthusiasts, wildlife observers and most importantly, the natural environment. We, as a community, feel that it is important for the environment to be protected and thus understand certain steps may be 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 away 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 wildlife.  
We strongly feel that the Historical, Cultural, and Economic ramifications of the proposed plans have not been adequately addressed by the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) as is required.  
Should the environmental changes impact our communities' sport (as it would in Plans D, E, & F) we would be forced to reconsider our frequent and environmentally friendly utilization of the Outer Banks. Other user groups such as surfers, fishermen, beachcombers, and virtually all other forms of tourism will also be discouraged from visiting Cape Hatteras if beach closures are greatly expanded. This will have a severely negative impact on the local economy and way of life that the residents of Hatteras Island have enjoyed for many generations. It will also take away something that is important to the lives of thousands of people throughout the United States and around the world.  
Sincerely, Philip Weber

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3600    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.06.2010 08:12:42  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** "I am a fisherman and resident of North Carolina who enjoys recreational opportunities offered by the Cape Hatteras National Seashore and Recreational Area. Reasonable and safe pedestrian and vehicular access to the beach is essential to participate and enjoy these resources and opportunities. I also support restrictions and conditions necessary to protect the birds, sea turtles, and other biota that are supported by scientific data and can make the Seashore home for part of the year. I believe the favor alternative (#7) advanced by the NPS is more restrictive than necessary to meet protection of the Seashore. I have read and agree with the proposal to manage ORV's on the Seashore prepared and submitted for consideration by the Coalition for Beach Access. My position is that the NPS accept this alternative or at least postpone a final decision on the ORV Plan pending further review and negotiation on the counter points raised by the Coalition for Beach Access."

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3601    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.06.2010 08:20:32  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Superintendent Murray, I have read the ORV DEIS six alternatives and strongly disagree with all. I have also read the 77 page Coalition For Beach Access that has been endorsed by several groups that were a part of the negotiated rule making process and I believe it far exceeds the DEIS in providing the best possible beach experience for our visitors and protects the needs of our fragile resources. Please consider all aspects of the Coalitions plan and help put people back into the management of our Cape Hatteras National Sea Shore. Respectively, Hank Connelly

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3602    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Amos, Jerry L  
**Received:** May.06.2010 08:24:17  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I support ORV use on the beaches.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3603    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** May,06,2010 08:26:25  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I disagree with the ORV Management Plan. The recommendations outlined are overreaching and could drastically impact the economic industry of the surrounding counties. It appears the plan does not just demonstrate protection for wildlife but instead restricts the future potential use of the land. The closure needed around wildlife and the timeframes for access to the beach appear to be the most unreasonable and potentially crippling restrictions to the area.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3604    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 08:28:37  
**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:** 3605    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 08:34:31  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I travel from the UK to hatteras on average at least once a year. I specifically come to kitesurf off the beaches of Hatteras. Disallowing access to the beach for this wind-powered, non-polluting sport, would cause me to re-consider coming to this beautiful area of nature. We need to keep access (via footpaths and other designated areas perhaps) through the beach to the ocean. Education - via awareness posters and walkways would be a better way of addressing your concerns.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3606    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** unknown, unknown  
**Received:** Apr,20,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** I disagree with the proposals I have read. I fish a lot, my relatives fish and visit here for this reason. We p u \_ \_ \_ or Oregon inlet with \_ \_ c h \_ \_ and can't. Please do not do this for economic reasons that will have a negative impact on tourism.  
I agree with night driving restrictions on \_ \_ \_ \_ \_ \_ \_ \_ .  
Illegible signature

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3607    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** unknown, unknown  
**Received:** Apr,26,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** 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 areas 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.  
Insert of map showing Cape Point  
RED line-area to be cleared Blue lines-swales to extend shoreline for feeding nesting habitat Look at the Prenesting closure map for Cape Point 2009, it clearly shows plovers nesting away from vegetation. These birds will find another shoreline away from CHNSRA if they are forced closer to the active shoreline.  
Draft Off-Road Vehicle Management Plan /

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3608    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Laudenslager, John  
**Received:** May,06,2010 08:38:04  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I agree that beach closures for shorter or longer terms may be necessary to protect biodiversity.  
However, because those closures subtract from humanity's ability to appreciate nature through direct contact, they should be the last resort.  
All other efforts, first being the restricting or rolling back of near shore building, should be done in preference to closing beaches. Also, noise and petrochemical polluting activities and those that tear up plant life above and below the water surface, should be restricted to the maximum before other public access is restricted.  
In prioritizing our interaction with nature in order to protect its diversity, I think restrictions should fall on building, pollution, and rough economic extraction, before closure to other activities.  
Thank you,  
John Laudenslager jjjlaudenslager@yahoo.com an Army retiree

**Correspondence ID:** 3609    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Corbett, Nicole L  
**Received:** May,06,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Mr. Murray,

It has been brought to my attention that a variety of plans are being considered in response to proposed environmental and ecological concerns. The Outer Banks of North Carolina is a sanctuary for many beach goers, sports enthusiasts, wildlife observers and most importantly, the natural environment. I feel that it is important for the environment to be protected and thus understand certain steps may be 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 away 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 wildlife.

Should the environmental changes impact the recreational use of the ocean and sound, as a kiteboarder, I would be forced to reconsider my frequent and environmentally friendly utilization of the Outer Banks. I imagine that other user groups such as surfers, fishermen, beachcombers, and virtually all other forms of tourism will also be discouraged from visiting Cape Hatteras if beach closures are greatly expanded. This will have a severely negative impact on the local economy and way of life that the residents of Hatteras Island have enjoyed for many generations. It will also take away something that is important to the lives of thousands of people throughout the United States and around the world.

Thank you for your time and I hope that a reasonable decision is made that will not negatively affect these beautiful islands.

Sincerely, Nicole Corbett

**Correspondence ID:** 3610    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** unknown, unknown  
**Received:** Apr,26,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** Bullet Points - Dare County DEIS Position NON-ENDANGERED BIRDS

? Under the Endangered Species Act (ESA), all endangered species must be protected. However, there is no requirement in the ESA to give non-endangered species the same level of protection.

? Dare County believes the National Park Service should reevaluate its position of giving birds that are designated only as a North Carolina species of concern, the same protection as those truly endangered.

? This reevaluation throughout all portions of the DEIS is consistent with management practices in other federal parks.

? The purpose of individual states, such as North Carolina, establishing lists of species of concern is to earmark certain species for special statement monitoring and tracking .

The management buffers described in DEIS pages 121 to 127 should be modified to allow pre-nesting closures for only endangered or threatened species. This would result in establishing pre-nesting closures exclusively for th, Piping Plover, the only threatened bird species in the seashore.

Also, pre-nesting closures are not warranted for the non-endangered and non-threatened American Oystercatchers. Because Colonial Waterbirds do not return to the exact same place for nesting each year, establishing pre-nesting closures for these birds is both unpredictable and unnecessary.

? Additionally, in monitoring & tracking birds for purposes of determining resource viability, all birds in the same ecosystem of the seashore should be counted.

? When conducting a bird census of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area, it is imperative to count the many birds on the nearby dredge and spoil islands that are located just yards away and within sight of the seashore. These birds are part of the same ecosystem and should be included.

? Other important key points for all topics - Dare County Supports

- o Open and accessible beaches for everyone
- o Believes access is consistent w/ promises made in the enabling legislation
- o Our residents and visitors have always been faithful stewards of wildlife

We believe people and nature can live in harmony and that science-based resource protection can be balanced with providing recreational access.

**Correspondence ID:** 3611    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Thorne, Cindy  
**Received:** Apr,22,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** I am writing in response to the proposed Draft Environmental Impact Statement for The Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

I have been going to Hatteras Island for 15 years. I have owned a house there for ten years. I am getting close to retirement age and have planned on spending more time there.

I really can't understand the closing off of the whole beach for birds. My parents raised all kind of wild birds (turkeys, quail, peasanets, etc.) when a nest was disturbed they moved and built a new nest. From what I have read there has not been any increase in the number of chicks that have fledged. So why would you increase the sizes and places that the beach will be closed, not only to vehicles but to pedestrians too.

But my biggest worry is that you are going to close the beach from March 15 - July 31 to pets. I take my 2 St. Bernards to the beach every year in April. They love the beach. I obey the rules (keep on a 6ft. Leash and clean up after them.) Why should my dogs and me be punished for people who don't obey the law. Spend some time arresting and fining them and then maybe they will follow the law.

From reading the DEIS Assessment you are making everything worse than the Consent Agreement in effect now. You are going to kill Hatteras Island. People will not come here if they can't go on the beach, either walking or in vehicles. More and more people bring their pets. Why come if they can't go on the beach with them. Our country right now is in terrible shape. Hatteras Island does not have big industry to fall back on just the tourist trade. Close the beaches and that industry will go too.

Stand up for the people who live on Hatteras. Keep the promise that was given when our government took over this seashore.

Thank you for listening.

**Correspondence ID:** 3612    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Corbett, Crystal and James  
**Received:** Apr,26,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** I disagree with the NPS policy of only moving high-risk turtle nests when a storm is eminent. There are a lot of resident volunteers whom would help with the moving. A lot of turtles would be saved if they were moved like they are at other beaches.

**Correspondence ID:** 3613    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Corbett, Crystal and James  
**Received:** Apr,26,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** I disagree with the NPS. "Plan F".

1. If beach driving is dangerous to birds, then why do the NPS ride up and down the beach?
2. Why doesn't the NPS remove the acre of vegetation around the closures at Cape Point so the birds wouldn't have to build their nests so close to the water and get washed away?
3. I believe that responsible beach driving is completely safe for birds. In all the years there have been very few infractions and none that resulted in bird deaths

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3614    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Corbett, Crystal and James  
**Received:** Apr,26,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** I disagree with the proposed Plan F 1000 meter buffer zone for the piping plover. It exceeds the 200 meter buffer zone as the standard set for federal protection of the PIPL. As stated in the NPS 2008 PIPL management report, table 5A, the chicks moved 155 meters from one nest from hatch to fledge. 147m at another nest, and 208m at another nest. I disagree that they need 1000 m.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3615    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Regarding the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. I ask that any plan that is approved will do the following:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families 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. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.?

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3616    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Corbett, Crystal and James  
**Received:** Apr,26,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** I strongly disagree with the predator trapping program. There have been many river otter trapped and they are on the endangered species list. The piping plover is not on the list for this area. A rare breed is being destroyed to further a bird that is not on the list. Also, people's pet cats have been trapped and killed. We have spent money to have them spayed and we feed them. Also a red fox was shot by a park ranger on the beach, in front of children. I find this cruel and inhumane. I believe all wildlife should be protected.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3617    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Corbett, Crystal and James  
**Received:** Apr,26,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** I disagree with the NPS Plan F. The consent decree and all the closures have not increased the PIPL population at all, in fact, according to your own resource management report, the piping plover has decreased from 2008. If beach driving is harmful, then why are there less PIPL with less driving- shouldn't the numbers have increased with more closures?  
In 2003= 50% hatching rate  
2005 =100% 2007 =: 40% 2008 =23%  
The weather(storms) have controlled the PIPL population, not beach driving. As you can see from the statistics above, some of the best hatch rates were when there was more beach driving.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3618    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Barker, Doug  
**Received:** Apr,20,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** I am writing this letter in support of free and open access to the Cape Hatteras National Recreational Seashore for both pedestrians and ORVs. The congressional creation of this recreational seashore in 1937 was to preserve the area for recreational purposes for the public.  
SUBCHAPTER LXIII-NATIONAL SEASHORE RECREATIONAL AREAS  
Sec. 459. Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area; conditional establishment; acquisition of lands  
When title to all the lands, except those within the limits of established villages, within boundaries to be designated by the Secretary of the Interior within the area of approximately one hundred square miles on the islands of Chicamacomico, Ocracoke, Bodie, Roanoke, and Cotlington, and the waters and the lands beneath the waters adjacent thereto shall have been vested in the United 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: Provided, That the United States shall not purchase by appropriation of public moneys any lands within the aforesaid area, but such lands shall be secured by the United States only by public or private donation. (Aug. 17, 1937, ch. 687, Sec. 1.50 Stat. 669; June 29, 1940, ch. 459, Sec. 1, 54 Stat. 702.)  
The DEIS that is being introduced will undermine this initial legislation. I believe the efforts made in the past by the park service in order to protect the flora and fauna were fair and effective. Denying public access to mass acreage to the seashore due to sightings of certain wildlife will not benefit the wildlife any more than efforts that were made in the past.  
If the DEIS proposal is put into effect, it will have devastating consequences to the tourist industry that the Outer Banks relies upon. Many jobs will be lost; the economy for the counties will collapse, and will leave many residents destitute. The closings that have already taken place have already proven to be adversely affecting the local businesses.  
Please consider a more effective plan that we could all support. One that will benefit the Wildlife, residents, and visitors for years to come.

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3619	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	
<b>Name:</b>	McLean, Angus D					
<b>Received:</b>	May,06,2010 00:00:00					
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>What are you worried about? You have bigger problems from storm damage. The last time I was to the Outerbanks the municipalities were bulldozing the beach back up onto the shore. I'm sure the next big storm erased the dozers efforts and highlighted the waste of fuel for what it was. Your efforts to preserve the natural enviroment will amount to the same but will limit the # of people that will witness your efforts. If you consider the cleansing effect that a good storm has you really have little to worry about from humans and their various vehicles using the beaches. Use common sense and find something more savable.</p>					
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3620	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	
<b>Name:</b>	Folb, Frank					
<b>Received:</b>	Apr,26,2010 00:00:00					
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Letter					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>Please accept this letter as my first comment on the NPS DEIS for Off Road Vehicle Management Plan.</p> <p>While we have had to exist under the terms of the draconian rule of the judge's approval of the consent decree demanded by the environment special interest groups and agreed to at gun point by local access groups to have any access at all. I find the six plans in the DEIS's 800 plus pages totally unacceptable.</p> <p>This comment is in regard to the pre-nesting bird closures throughout the seashore and the early additional closures now installed when only 2 piping plovers have nests within the Cape Point closure and 7 oystercatcher nests in the entire seashore have been found.</p> <p>If you want it is okay without interruption to walk from the south boarder of Pea Island Wildlife Refuge to Oregon Inlet (13 miles+-) without encountering a bird enclosure. However, if you examine the 4-22-2010 NPS Beach Access Report and add the number of miles closed to "PEOPLE" you will see that there are 10.3 miles closed in the seashore recreational area and another 3.3 miles with limited access (You can only get to by boat) for a total of 13.6 or more than the entire wildlife refuge beaches.</p> <p>Closures in a refuge could be understood, but when NPS who has a dual mandate to not only protect birds, but to also protect the rights of access to its visiting people, common sense observation shows that NPS is making bad decisions in these closures. Differences in buffers and management within the USFW Refuge and a Recreational seashore would seem to be more aggressive in the refuge while more lenient in the recreational seashore, but this is not the case, has not been the case in recent years and only gets worse in the NPS Preferred Alternative "F".</p> <p>NPS in the implementation of this plan must review their preferred plan and the "Coalition for Access" position statement and find a common ground that we all can exist.</p> <p>Thank you for this opportunity to comment and I do hope that the faith I have lost in my government can be reversed in how these comments are used in this plan.</p>					
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3621	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	
<b>Name:</b>	Trufan, Hal					
<b>Received:</b>	May,06,2010 00:00:00					
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>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. We ask that any plan that is approved will do the following:</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>Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best 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>					
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3622	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b> Y
<b>Name:</b>	private					
<b>Received:</b>	May,06,2010 08:58:35					
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>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.</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</p>					

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3623    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 08:58:35  
**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:** 3624    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 08:58:36  
**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:** 3625    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 08:58:36  
**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:** 3626    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 08:58:36  
**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:** 3627    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 08:58:36  
**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:** 3628    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 08:58:36  
**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:** 3629    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 08:58:37  
**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:** 3630    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 08:58:40  
**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:** 3631    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 08:58:41  
**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:** 3632    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 08:58:41  
**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:** 3633    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 08:58:41  
**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:** 3634    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 08:58:41  
**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:** 3635    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 08:58:41  
**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.  
As a North Carolina native who grew up only a short drive from the state's beautiful seacoast, I urge you to be responsible and ethical and protect wildlife by adopting this alternative plan.  
That plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3636    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 08:58:46  
**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:** 3637    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 08:58:46  
**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:** 3638    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 08:58:46  
**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:** 3639    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 08:58:46  
**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:** 3640    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 08:58:46  
**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:** 3641    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 08:58:46  
**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:** 3642    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 08:58:46  
**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:** 3643    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 08:58:46  
**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.

0009787

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3644    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 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.  
National Seashores are for all of us not just for local ORV users. I must speak up remotely, but please hear me out!  
These seabirds and shorebirds have no where else to go and we must protect them!  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3645    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 08:58:51  
**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:** 3646    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 08:58:52  
**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:** 3647    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 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.

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3648    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 08:58:52  
**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:** 3649    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 08:58:52  
**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:** 3650    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 08:58:52  
**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.

Sincerely,

Mary Heathcoat PO Box 1303 Fuquay Varina, NC 27526

**Correspondence ID:** 3651    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 08:58:53  
**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:** 3652    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 08:58:57  
**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:** 3653    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 08:58:57  
**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:** 3654    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 08:58:57  
**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:** 3655    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 08:58:57  
**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:** 3656    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 08:58:57  
**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:** 3657    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 08:58:57

**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:** 3658    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 08:58:57

**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:** 3659    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 08:59:02

**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:** 3660    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 08:59:03  
**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:** 3661    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 08:59:03  
**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:** 3662    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 08:59:03  
**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. 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. painter.james@insightbb.com. A true conservationist is a man who knows that the world is not given by his fathers but borrowed from his children - John James Audubon, 1785-1851.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3663    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 08:59:03  
**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:** 3664    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 08:59:03  
**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:** 3665    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 08:59:03  
**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:** 3666    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 08:59:03  
**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:** 3667    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 08:59:03  
**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:** 3668    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 08:59:07  
**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:** 3669    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 08:59:07

**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:** 3670    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 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.

At this juncture in time, we must apply sustainability to all issues dealing with our environment. We must strive for a way to allow humans to use the resource while maintaining a healthy environment for all creatures that inhabit the planet, now and in the future! SUSTAINABILITY!

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Correspondence ID:** 3671    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 08:59:08

**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:** 3672    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 08:59:08  
**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:** 3673    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 08:59:08  
**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:** 3674    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 08:59:08  
**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:** 3675    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 08:59:08  
**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:** 3676    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 08:59:08  
**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. ORV operation not only deprives other visitors of a peaceful experience, ORVs are disturbing to wildlife, and cause unnecessary air pollution.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 3677    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 08:59:13  
**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:** 3678    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 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 stop destroying the few natural wonders we have left. Haven't flora and fauna suffered enough in the name of progress, development and just plain human selfishness? Don't the nimrods who drive ORV's have enough places to ride without them destroying more land? Please. Enough is enough. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3679    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 08:59:13  
**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:** 3680    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 08:59:13  
**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:** 3681    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 08:59:13

**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:** 3682    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 08:59:13

**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:** 3683    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 08:59:13

**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:** 3684    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 08:59:13

**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.  
I live near the beach and can tell you motorized vehicles don't belong there. They drip oil, make too much noise, spray sand, and are ugly to behold. There is nothing more disappointing than to go to the beach to get away from the noise and traffic from town only to deal with cars and other vehicles on the beach.  
Lately there have been people run over and killed or seriously injured at our local beaches. Don't let it happen at your seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 3685    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 08:59:14

**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:** 3686    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 08:59:19

**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:** 3687    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 08:59:19  
**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:** 3688    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 08:59:19  
**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:** 3689    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 08:59:19  
**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:** 3690    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 08:59:19  
**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:** 3691    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 08:59:19  
**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:** 3692    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 08:59:19  
**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:** 3693    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 08:59:19  
**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:** 3694    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 08:59:19  
**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:** 3695    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 08:59:25  
**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:** 3696    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 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 is important to me because it would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and cause less disturbance of wildlife.  
I would like a final plan to include the following:  
\* Prioritize Natural Resources first. If we do not protect our natural resources, our beaches will diminish in value to humans as well. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best 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, which requires further restrictions on ORV use. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families 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. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3697    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 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:** 3698    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 08:59:26  
**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:** 3699    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 08:59:26  
**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:** 3700    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 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 policy should reflect the reality that the rapidly expanding US population will result in less and less actual natural community areas for recreational users to visit, relative to the demand of this same population. Thus the recreational value of such natural areas will grow relative to the total area available for any type of outdoor recreation. There are many, many more people involved in bird watching, wildflower watching, and nature study hobbyists than any other single form of leisure 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:** 3701    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 08:59:26  
**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:** 3702    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 08:59:31  
**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:** 3703    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 08:59:31  
**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:** 3704    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 08:59:32  
**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:** 3705    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 08:59:32  
**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:** 3706    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 08:59:32  
**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:** 3707    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 08:59:32  
**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 but even more so, are critical to the survival of our native wildlife populations.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3708    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 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 be considered in the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. If 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 more safely enjoy the Seashore with more walkways. Wildlife could have a better chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park, if ORV use is decreased.  
\*Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first. Recreational use should be carefully controlled. Adequate areas need to be set aside that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3709    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 08:59:41  
**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:** 3710    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 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. ORV users ruin the experience for other people and destroy wildlife. I support prohibiting ORV's.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 3711    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 08:59:42  
**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:** 3712    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 08:59:42  
**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:** 3713    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 08:59:42  
**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.  
Dear Superintendent Murray,  
Following are my comments on the DEIS for the Cape Hatteras national Seashore ORV Management Plan.  
I live in Florida where driving on the beach has been considered a right for decades. I have no quarrel with those who wish to sunbath on a beach which looks more like a parking lot -- there are lots of beaches where I can go where driving is not allowed.  
However, it seems that the ORV drivers at Cape Hatteras National Seashore feel that only their wishes have merit. They need to remember that a "National" park belongs to all the people of the US, not just those folks who live nearby. I support a plan where beach driving is allowed in areas which are not nesting sites for shorebirds -- whether the birds are endangered or not. Hugenot Beach in Jacksonville, FL, recently decided to disallow all beach driving to protect the nesting colonies of Least Terns and Piping Plovers, among other beach-nesting species.  
Equal amounts of beach need to be allocated for non-driving recreation and beach-nesting sites need special protection during the nesting season. Public education helps beach users understand the need to close certain portions of the beach for a very short period of time -- incubation through fledging. In the grand scheme, this is a short period of time and only affects a small portion of the beach. Life gets tougher for wildlife each year as habitat is lost to development. It is imperative that our parks provide protection for all species possible to continue their procreation cycle.  
Thank you for taking my comments into your consideration. I look forward to seeing a plan that balances the wishes of ALL park visitors and protects the needs of wildlife.

**Correspondence ID:** 3714    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 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 the natural environment.

The following principles should direct the formulation of the final NPS plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D.

Provide equal access to the resources for all visitor groups. Under the NPS's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a reasonable balance for other user groups and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, 50 percent or 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 more balanced access for all park visitors and as important, allow wildlife populations the opportunity to return to more historic numbers.

Protection of the natural environment and wildlife of the Seashore should come first and recreational use should be managed consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating and wintering species. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased as necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. If annual reviews determine that bird, turtle and plant populations are not stabilizing and/or increasing as planned, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals and the management to obtain them should be utilized for all species; whether breeding, migrating or wintering at the Seashore.

Thank you for your efforts in developing a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural environment of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3715    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 08:59:50  
**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:** 3716    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 08:59:51  
**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.

Please do everything in your power to protect our birds!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3717    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 08:59:51  
**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:** 3718    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 08:59:51

**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:** 3719    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 08:59:51

**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:** 3720    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 08:59:51

**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:** 3721    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 08:59:51  
**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.  
The human species has an opportunity to improve its stewardship of the environment, a responsibility it has been remiss in fulfilling. Please do everything you can to further this critical need's response.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3722    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 08:59:56  
**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.  
For so much of human history, people have shared the earth with other animals in some sort of balance. In the last few centuries, and increasingly so in the last 100 years, human technology has given us the power to disregard the needs and lives of our other co-inhabitants of this fragile earth. We need to respect the needs of the others. We should respect them as fellow creatures with food and habitat requirements, but we need to respect them because the earth will not be ours to inhabit if we do not. Perhaps we are the beginning of the great extinction that could end in our own extinction. A plover nest may not seem important, but the life of a threatened plover could be the harbinger for the degraded quality of human life, or even of human existence. This may seem overblown for a draft environmental impact statement. But why else are we considering the effect on the environment if not for these reasons: respect for our fellow creatures, hope for a quality of life that includes a full variety of natures creations, a healthy planet that will support human life.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3723    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 08:59:56  
**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:** 3724    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 08:59:56

**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:** 3725    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 08:59:56

**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:** 3726    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 08:59:56

**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:** 3727    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 08:59:56  
**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:** 3728    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 08:59:56  
**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:** 3729    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Lancaster, Mitch  
**Received:** May,06,2010 08:59:58  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** My family has enjoyed Cape Hatteras National Seashore for over 25 years. We have spent many days enjoying the beauty and nature that this great park has to offer. If we catch fish that is a bonus, but our real objective is to enjoy the beach. We have I think been good citizens by obeying the speed limits and driving only in designated approved areas. We have owned a house in Kill Devil Hills for over 22 years and also invested in property in Old Nags Head Cove which we still own. I would hate not to be able to drive on our designated beaches and more importantly my children and grandchildren would not be able to enjoy our beaches like we have. Our investments in the Outer Banks will be over if this is not allowed. Thank You for listening.  
Mitch Lancaster

**Correspondence ID:** 3730    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 09:00:02

**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. Though I live far away from Cape Hatteras in Oregon, the fate of the sea turtles and other creatures matters to me.

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

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

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

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

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

**Correspondence ID:** 3731    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 09:00:02

**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:** 3732    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 09:00:03

**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:** 3733    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 09:00:03

**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:** 3734    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 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 uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

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

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

\*Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering 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 until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

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

**Correspondence ID:** 3735    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 09:00:03

**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. These values are very important to me. I used to live in North Carolina and made at least one trip per year to the Outer Banks, the wildlife there is a part of my treasured memories.

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

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

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

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

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

**Correspondence ID:** 3736    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 09:00:03  
**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:** 3737    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 09:00:03  
**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:** 3738    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Stuyvesant, Fay  
**Received:** Apr,16,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:**

My husband and I have been visiting the Outer Banks for the last ten years. Four years ago, when I retired, we purchased a travel trailer and spend 2 months at the Outer Bank each year.  
 We were unhappy to hear about some proposed changes to beach access.  
 1) Beach closure to vehicles. We love to fish on the beach. However, we are both in our sixties and suffer from arthritis. Unfortunately, we won't be able to fish if we have to park, walk and carry our fishing gear.  
 2) We also travel with our dog. Beach closure to pets would certainly have our travel to the Outer Banks cease.  
 3) Economic impact ? We spend a great amount of money while vacationing. Talking to the locals last fall it became obvious that many were finding it hard to make ends meet.  
 I would sincerely hope that extensive beach closures and restrictions be reconsidered. Our economy in this country has been in trouble. I would hate to think of the economic impact some of these provisions would have on the Outer Banks economy.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3739    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 09:00:08  
**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:** 3740    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 09:00:08  
**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:** 3741    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 09:00:09  
**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.  
Have you ever seen a Piping Plover? Before you make this decision, watch one, or at least look at a picture. How could you not protect something so cute???

**Correspondence ID:** 3742    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 09:00:09  
**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:** 3743    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 09:00:09

**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:** 3744    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 09:00:09

**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:** 3745    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 09:00:09

**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:** 3746    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 09:00:12  
**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:** 3747    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 09:00:15  
**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:** 3748    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 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 balanced final plan for visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 3749    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 09:00:15  
**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:** 3750    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 09:00:15  
**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:** 3751    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 09:00:15  
**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:** 3752    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 09:00:15

**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:** 3753    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 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 Superintendent Murray:

Please help me understand why vehicles should be allowed to drive on the sands of Cape Hatteras National Seashore? This should be thrown out immediately. Don't vehicle owners have enough areas to drive their vehicles without killing or hurting more sensitive land, which we as a country are doing our best to destroy any vacant land so more money can be slipped into the dishonest people governing our nation.

Do you honestly trust anyone in the government? For the past so-many years, I have sadly come to realize that all the D.C. people want -- is to fill their pockets with greedy money and then to vote dishonestly.

For the Love of God--please help us to save another small fragment of our sensitive land, so with time, maybe some of our precious land be saved, such as birds, fish, mammals Blue Crab, oysters? Help me understand why this operation was even put to a vote. They cannot be lovers of the outdoors.

Please help the Audubon Society do their job!!

If you have children or any other family member with idea's of destroying even more land please think of the impact and to what degree this will happen, PLEASE!!!

No one

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Correspondence ID:** 3754    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 09:00:21  
**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:** 3755    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 09:00:21  
**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:** 3756    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 09:00:21  
**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:** 3757    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 09:00:21  
**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:** 3758    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 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 oposed to ANY more closure of Public lands to Off Highway use. While I'm at work earning a living (and paying ever increasing taxes) the folks that are voted into office(you and others) are bussy making changes that negatively effect my leisure time. THIS Must stop! A small minority of people beleive that any motorized enjoyment of nature is wrong. Therefore these people exploit laws to satisfy their agenda.  
These type of changes should be put to a vote of the people not slam dunked by lawmakers or railroaded by department heads.  
GIVE US BACK OUR LAND !

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3759    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 09:00:21  
**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:** 3760    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 09:00:21  
**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:** 3761    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 09:00:22  
**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:** 3762    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 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,  
Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage the use of Off Road Vehicles on our beautiful North Carolina shoreline at Cape Hatteras National Seashore. I grew up visiting this area and I remember my father making numerous trips with friends to the area. It has certainly changed.  
Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access with of course specific criteria for public use of the area. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. One particular area that I am familiar with in Florida is the Coffeen Nature Preserve in the Panhandle Area. They have done a wonderful job of allowing pedestrian access while protecting birds and sea turtles!  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.  
With kind regards,  
Margaret Thomas Schnitzer

**Correspondence ID:** 3763    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 09:00:28  
**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:** 3764    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 09:00:28

**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:** 3765    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 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 strongly feel that ORV's are destructive no matter where they are used, and particularly so in sensitive areas such as those being considered. I have seen first hand at local refuges the devastation to the environment that these vehicles cause, and the blatant disregard for wildlife that many of the users of these vehicles exhibit. I implore you to sterner measures to limit the use of ORV's, and thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 3766    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 09:00:28

**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:** 3767    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 09:00:28

**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:** 3768    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 09:00:35

**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:** 3769    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 09:00:35

**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:** 3770    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 09:00:35

**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:** 3771    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 09:00:35

**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:** 3772    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 09:00:35  
**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:** 3773    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 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 be more appropriate to your mission. ORV are simply not compatible with wildlife, soils and vegetation, and low impact recreation for the majority of visitors.  
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3774    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 09:00:35  
**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:** 3775    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 09:00:41  
**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:** 3776    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 09:00:41

**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:** 3777    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 09:00:41

**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:** 3778    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 09:00:41

**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,

0009831

migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3779    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 09:00:41  
**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:** 3780    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 09:00:41  
**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:** 3781    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 09:00:46  
**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,

0009832

migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3782    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 09:00:47  
**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:** 3783    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 09:00:47  
**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:** 3784    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 09:00:47  
**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:** 3785    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 09:00:47

**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:** 3786    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 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. \* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are 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. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

**Correspondence ID:** 3787    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 09:00:47

**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:** 3788    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 09:00:47  
**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:** 3789    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 09:00:52  
**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:** 3790    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 09:00:52  
**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:** 3791    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 09:00:52  
**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:** 3792    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 09:00:52  
**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:** 3793    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 09:00:52  
**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:** 3794    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 09:00:57  
**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:** 3795    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 09:00:57  
**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:** 3796    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 09:00:57  
**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:** 3797    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 09:00:57  
**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:** 3798    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 09:00:57  
**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:** 3799    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 09:00:59  
**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:** 3800    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 09:01:02  
**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:** 3801    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 09:01:02  
**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:** 3802    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 09:01:03  
**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:** 3803    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 09:01:03  
**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:** 3804    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 09:01:03  
**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:** 3805    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 09:01:03  
**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:** 3806    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 09:01:03  
**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:** 3807    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 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.  
WHEN I WAS GROWING UP, I WAS TAUGHT THAT THERE IS A PLACE FOR EVERYTHING AND EVERYTHING HAS ITS PLACE. THIS PRINCIPLE HAS SERVED ME WELL FOR 60 YEARS AND IT HAS SERVED THE NATIONAL PARKS FAIRLY WELL TOO OVER THE YEARS.  
BUT, TODAY MORE AND MORE PEOPLE HAVE LOST TOUCH WITH WHY THE NATIONAL PARKS HAVE BEEN SET ASIDE FOR FUTURE GENERATIONS, AND THEY LOOK TO THESE PARKS AS SOME SORT OF ENTERTAINMENT CENTER.  
ORVs DON'T BELONG ON BEACHES OR DESERTS SANDS OR IN NATIONAL PARKS IN GENERAL. THEY ARE LOUD AND ENCOURAGE LOUD BEHAVIOR. THERE FUN TAKES AWAY FROM THE ENJOYMENT OF THE PARK FOR ALL THOSE WHO HAVE COME TO APPRECIATE THE SPECIALNESS OF THE SITE AND THE BEAUTY OF NATURE.  
ASK YOURSELF IF AN ACTIVITY IN THE PARK WILL SPOIL IT FOR OTHERS AND/OR THE FUTURE. IF THE ANSWER IS "YES", THEN NATIONAL PARKS ARE NOT THE PLACE FOR THAT ACTIVITY, PERIOD.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3808    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 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.

If it were up to me, only park rangers would be able to legally use ORV's on park land. ORV's ruin the park land experience for the the rest of us and are deadly to the wildlife. I am on Social Security Disability and I say, if you can't get up and walk to the area, don't go.

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3809    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 09:01:03  
**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:** 3810    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 09:01:08  
**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:** 3811    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 09:01:08  
**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:** 3812    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 09:01:08  
**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:** 3813    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 09:01:08  
**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:** 3814    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 09:01:08  
**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:** 3815    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 09:01:08  
**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:** 3816    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 09:01:13  
**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:** 3817    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 09:01:13  
**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:** 3818    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 09:01:13  
**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:** 3819    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 09:01:13  
**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:** 3820    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 09:01:13  
**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:** 3821    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 09:01:14  
**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.  
I have been to our National Parks and had the quiet peacefulness disrupted with ORV enthusiast. There are other places for them to ride without damaging our wild places and the habitat that depends upon our protection.  
Thanks for listening.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3822    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 09:01:14  
**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:** 3823    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 09:01:14  
**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:** 3824    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 09:01:14  
**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:** 3825    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 09:01:14  
**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:** 3826    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 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 light of the obvious threat which ORVs pose to the environmental integrity of a National (!) Seashore, it is both unjust and inexcusable that non-ORV users --- not to mention the wildlife itself --- are not offered any significant protection from the impact 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 immensely important to me, my family and many friends on the east coast who treasure the fragile CHNS.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this

approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

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

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3827    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 09:01:19  
**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:** 3828    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 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. Motorized and non-motorized wheelchairs and walkers can share the walkways with non-challenged visitors. National Seashores are fragile environments that need to be protected for those wildlife and plant species dependent on them. They should not be amusement parks for people wishing to zoom around on ORVs looking for thrill rides.  
Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3829    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 09:01:19  
**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:** 3830    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 09:01:19

**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:** 3831    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 09:01:19

**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:** 3832    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 09:01:19

**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:** 3833    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 09:01:19  
**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:** 3834    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 09:01:19  
**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:** 3835    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** May,06,2010 09:01:24  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear NPS,  
I feel the DEIS is too restrictive for the following reasons:  
1. Buffers of 1000 meters for Piping Plovers are excessive and unnecessary. 2. Dogs on leashes are not a threat to wildlife 3. The DEIS does not have an accurate estimate of how the restrictions will affect the local economy. Under the Consent Decree, businesses have been negatively affected therefore why would you approve a plan that is even more restrictive? 4. The DEIS will greatly affect the culture of Cape Hatteras which is based on beach access for recreation, fishing, surfing etc. There needs to be open corridors between closed nesting areas and access to surf zones. Most beach closures occur

during the busiest and best beach weather. 5.I disagree with the NPS being so influenced by environmental groups that you lose your focus. Management should be fair and balanced.Listen to people that live, work and vacation at Cape Hatteras. Don't listen to group of people , most of whom have never even been there, whose views are extreme. They are trying to fix something that was never a problem. 6. I agree with management. But it needs to make sense and be based on scientific facts. It needs to preserve the idea that the seashore was meant to be a recreational area for humans. Dredge islands make a wonderful breeding areas for birds, free of predators.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3836    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 09:01:24  
**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:** 3837    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 09:01:25  
**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:** 3838    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 09:01:25  
**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.  
I visit this area several times a year, pay rent, buy food and other items and enjoy the natural setting. My hobby is birdwatching. I think that if you stick with your plan as mentioned above that eventually the ORV folks might see that it is fair to all of us.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3839    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 09:01:25  
**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:** 3840    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 09:01:25  
**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:** 3841    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 09:01:25  
**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:** 3842    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 09:01:25  
**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:** 3843    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 09:01:30  
**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:** 3844    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 09:01:30  
**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:** 3845    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 09:01:30  
**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:** 3846    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 09:01:30

**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:** 3847    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 09:01:30

**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. Having lived in NC for 40 years (until 2 years ago) and as a frequent visitor to the Outer Banks, this is a very important issue to me.

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

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

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

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

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

**Correspondence ID:** 3848    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 09:01:36

**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:** 3849    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 09:01:42  
**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:** 3850    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** May,06,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** It has been brought to the attention of the kiteboarding community that a variety of plans are being considered in response to proposed environmental and ecological concerns. The Outer Banks of North Carolina is a sanctuary for many beach goers, sports enthusiasts, wildlife observers and most importantly, the natural environment. We, as a community, feel that it is important for the environment to be protected and thus understand certain steps may be 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 away 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 wildlife.  
We strongly feel that the Historical, Cultural, and Economic ramifications of the proposed plans have not been adequately addressed by the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) as is required.  
Should the environmental changes impact our communities' sport (as it would in Plans D, E, & F) we would be forced to reconsider our frequent and environmentally friendly utilization of the Outer Banks. Other user groups such as surfers, fishermen, beachcombers, and virtually all other forms of tourism will also be discouraged from visiting Cape Hatteras if beach closures are greatly expanded. This will have a severely negative impact on the local economy and way of life that the residents of Hatteras Island have enjoyed for many generations. It will also take away something that is important to the lives of thousands of people throughout the United States and around the world.  
If people, and especially children, can not experience the environment how are they going to learn to help you protect the environment?  
Kind Regards,

**Correspondence ID:** 3851    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Harris, Jim  
**Received:** Apr,27,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** Create Habitat DEIS 42510 I disagree with points made on page 88 of the DEIS; DE IS page 88; Create habitat through physical alteration or the creation of dredge islands. The NPS considered creating habitat through various methods. Based on the experience of staff at the NCWRC, habitat-creation projects tend to be short-lived and labor intensive. (#1 )Based on experience with hand pulling, herbicides, fires, and bulldozing, it was found that most of these techniques are effective for only one season before the vegetation returns. Covering areas with new dredge material has been shown to last longer, with vegetation returning after four to seven years (Cameron pers. comm. 2007). (#2A) Although the NPS recognizes that creation o of habitat may be viable under certain circumstances. (#2B)it is not an appropriate substitute for providing adequate protection of existing habitat. (#3) If this method is employed, it would occur outside the scope of the plan/EIS and therefore was not included in the alternatives.  
#1. A. Just as there are many yearly jobs to do on a timely basis, creating good habitat will take work. It could even be necessary to do habitat creation/restoration after a storm. B. There are a group of volunteers who are willing to trade ORV access to the Cape Point for labor, material, and equipment to clear vegetation and create feeding-resting habitat. Let us create the habitat and see if the birds will use it.  
#2A. The Creation of new habitat (for birds) will destroy habitat for predators. Your argument, to do nothing actually encourages predation of birds,

which are your prime object to protect. As long as vegetation is allowed to grow unfettered on the interiors of the points and spits, predators will be able to get close to feeding baby birds. Clearing these areas will give birds a better chance of fledging. #2B. it is not an appropriate substitute for providing adequate protection of existing habitat FOR PREDATORS

#3. Creating habitat on the interiors of the spits and points would get the birds off the beaches, allowing human use of the beaches.

If the objective of this work (DEIS-ORV RULE) is to do no work, then claim ORV and pedestrians are the reasons for such poor results. This will be challenged forever by both sides. The Hatteras Group of NPS personnel have actively dodged doing anything to help endangered & threatened species, while actively blaming their shortcomings on innocent soles who drive ORVs.

This National Seashore has a dual mandate to protect wildlife and to allow humans, current and future generations to use the Seashore, as it was planned in the mid-'30's. ? From DEIS page 3-4

#### PURPOSE AND SIGNIFICANCE OF CAPE HATTERAS NATIONAL SEASHORE

All units of the national park system were formed for a specific purpose (the reason they are significant) and to conserve significant resources or values for the enjoyment of future generations. The purpose and significance of the park provides the basis for identifying uses and values that individual NPS plans will support. The following provides background on the purpose and significance of the Seashore.

As stated in the Seashore's enabling legislation (the Act), Congress established the Seashore in 1937 as a national seashore 'for the enjoyment and benefit of the people, and to preserve the area. The Act states:

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 areas 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.

RED line-area to be cleared Blue lines-swales to extend shoreline for feeding nesting habitat Look at the Pre-nesting closure map for Cape Point 2009, it clearly shows plovers nesting away from vegetation. These birds will find another shoreline away from CHNSRA if they are forced closer to the active shoreline.

Elimination of vegetation in certain areas of the Point and Spits will encourage our birds to nest away from the high energy shorelines.

USFWS can work with NPS concerning "CRITICAL HABITAT". In a Midwestern State to NOT declare a reservoir Critical Habitat. Not declaring CH allowed manipulation of the habitat by burning or using heavy equipment to clear and level the banks on the reservoir to be made into better habitat.

I disagree with statements on page 88 of the DEIS 4 24 10 ? In National Seashores and National Parks excluding North Carolina, vegetation is burned, bulldozed, weed-killer used, ephemeral pools are created, nesting material applications are used to actively manipulate habitat. Why is there a refusal to do any of that here?

<http://www.fws.gov/arcata/es/birds/WSP/plover.html> (Snowy plover) page 181

2.2.1 Remove nonnative and other invasive vegetation from existing and potential habitat and replace with native dune vegetation. Land managers should implement remedial efforts to remove or reduce vegetation that is encroaching on western snowy plover breeding habitat or obstructing movement of chicks from nesting to feeding areas.

Why don't we do something like this here? Vegetation only protects predators here in CHNSRA

<http://ternandplover.unl.edu/2009%20IPR%20least%20Tern%20and%20Piping%20Plover%20Report.pdf> 2009 Annual report (found on page 61)

The Tern and Plover Conservation Partnership uses a voluntary, proactive approach to avoid and minimize bird-people conflicts and to reduce or eliminate the need for law enforcement personnel to be involved in tern and plover management. There were no conflicts or need for law enforcement recorded in 2009, as was the case in 2008.

Before terns and plovers returned to Nebraska and the field season began, TPCP met with the production managers of all area sand and gravel mines. At these meetings, we discussed the mining companies' production plans for the season, safety regulations, and site access. We paid particular attention to concerns mine personnel had regarding previous on-site activities of the TPCP and changes to MSHA (Mine Safety and Health Administration) policy as it applies to non-mine personnel. We also met with homeowners associations at the lakeshore housing developments. At these meetings, we discussed the construction plans for the area and site access. We paid particular attention to property owners' concerns regarding previous on-site activities of the TPCP. See Table 1 for a list of active and inactive sand and gravel mines and lakeshore housing developments in the Lower Platte River.

Based on our pre-nesting season conversations with mine production managers and homeowners' associations, we mapped out the areas where it would be best if the terns and plovers did not nest. These were the areas within the mine property that were going to be dredged during the nesting season or where heavy equipment was going to be operating. At the housing developments, these were the areas where buildings were to be constructed or utilities were to be installed.

A result of each of these meeting was site-specific management and monitoring plans; an equally valuable result was becoming acquainted with the people living and working at these sites. As the season progressed, this made our management efforts easier to implement. Throughout the season, we maintained close contact with these individuals so we could respond to any on-site changes that developed as the season progressed.

<http://fieldguide.mt.gov/detail/ABNNB03070.aspx>

The memorandum, in combination with a biological opinion from the USFWS, guides management actions at this location (USFWS 2003).

Management activities include moving nests upslope from areas where flooding of nests is imminent; using nest cages over nest bowls to prevent trampling and predation by avian predators; signing beaches to indicate nesting; beach enhancement (grading or burning unwanted encroaching vegetation); raising island elevation to make room to move nests in years with rising water during the nesting season; the release of captive-reared plovers (Erickson and Prellwitz 1999);

Cooperation with USFWS to specifically limit "Critical Habitat" so vegetation can be "controlled";

? DEIS page 189; "Section 7 of the ESA requires federal agencies to ensure that actions they authorize, fund, or carry out are not likely to destroy or adversely modify designated critical habitat. Activities that may destroy or adversely modify critical habitat include those that alter the primary constituent elements (PCEs) to an extent that the value of critical habitat for both the survival and recovery of the species is appreciably reduced (65 FR 41793)."

<http://fieldguide.mt.gov/detail/ABNNB03070.aspx>

This reservoir was excluded from the critical habitat designation because of a Memorandum of Understanding between the Bureau of Reclamation, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and the local irrigation districts

? DEIS page 190;

Of the 2,043 acres of designated critical habitat in Dare and Hyde counties, approximately 1,827 acres are located within the boundaries of the Seashore and are located at Bodie Island Spit, Cape Point, Hatteras Inlet Spit, Ocracoke Inlet Spit, and South Point (73 FR 62816).

1. NC-1: This unit extends from the southern portion of Bodie Island through Oregon Inlet
2. NC-2: This unit is entirely within the Seashore and encompasses Cape Point.
3. NC-4: This unit extends from the western end of Hatteras Island to the eastern end of Ocracoke Island.
4. NC-S: This unit is entirely within the Seashore and includes the western portion of Ocracoke Island

Prime chick feeding areas is also prime adult feeding area. A prime feeding area will be prime feeding area all year long, except during storm and celestial tide events, in which the areas could be overwashed.

To make this habitat restoration a success, several steps are necessary;

1. Apply weed killer, the grasses are "rhizome" grass. If it is cut topieces, the pieces will grow on their own.
2. Bulldoze the vegetation into small brush piles and use the piles to form a staggered row barrier dune as a buffer.
3. Create swales (shallow ditches) leading away from the water sources like fingers of a hand.

The shore nesting birds are territorial; they will defend their food source and nesting area. Just a normal shoreline is not enough, and the more shoreline that is created the greater the attraction for more birds.

DEIS Chapter 3 page 191;

Chicks with access to moist substrate habitat survived better than chicks without such access in Virginia (Loegering and Fraser 1995) and Rhode Island (Goldin and Regosin 1998). A study in New York in 1992 and 1993 found that piping plover broods had higher foraging rates in areas with ephemeral pools and tidal flats, which suggested that these habitats were superior. This study also documented higher incidences of arthropods in the moist

substrate habitat, which could explain the increased plover numbers and survival rates in these habitat types. Management implications of this study include conserving a variety of foraging habitat (Elias et al. 2000). Burger (1994) found that when broods had access to a diversity of foraging habitat zones, the impact of human disturbance was reduced because chicks had opportunities to escape disturbances and still forage.

By improving habitat at the points and spits, creating ephemeral pools and shallow water swales, plovers, AMOY, Knots, Wilson's plover, Gull-billed terns and the rest of the ground feeders would accept these feeding opportunities over a high-energy shoreline.

DEIS Chapter 3 page 205 ? Foreshore- 9.3% Inland Freshwater pond 0.4% Mud Flat/Algal flat 63.9% Sand flat 21.9% Surf Zone 0.1% Wrack line 3.6% Overwash 0.4% Backshore 0.4%

DEIS Chapter 3 page 207-208 Risk Factors

Small populations such as the Atlantic Coast piping plover populations face a heightened risk of extinction compared to large populations because they are more vulnerable to the following: (1) random environmental variations, such as storms; (2) reduction in genetic variations that limit a species' ability to adapt to local conditions; (3) sudden, random drops in birth and death rates; and (4) an impaired ability to find suitable mates (Lande 1988).

Deviant is not very diverse.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3852    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Borland, James S  
**Received:** Apr,22,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** Please note my objections to the following sections of alternative (F) of the NPS Beach management plan. (Bird closures)  
 1) p.468 inflexible buffers set at 300M ? unreasonable & arbitrary, that is approximately 5 football fields, most birds would be unaware of human presence. 100M would be more appropriate. (that is a football field distance)  
 2) p. 468 piping plover buffers set at 1000M (better than = of a mile) should be more in range of 200M (2 football fields). (Turtle closures)  
 1) Turtle nests could be safely moved from high density human areas, such as life guard beach area or Ocracoke Nests have been removed for other reasons without harm. (over wash (sp) storms, predator control)  
 (Possible Pet Restrictions)  
 1) Reason & common sense dictate that pets should be allowed on CHNS with restrictions (61 leash) Pet owners should be req'd to remove pet feces. (poop)  
 (Possible additional parking lots for beach access)  
 1) I disagree, would be costly, (construction & main.) would require harsh impact to wetlands & or beach. Much worse than ORV contact.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3853    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Bunn, Joe E  
**Received:** Apr,20,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** Bunn, Joe E. President Rocky Mount Cord Co. P.O. Drawer 4304 Rocky Mount, NC 27803-0304 www.rmcord.com E-mail: jbunn@rmcord.com  
 Please let all of us continue to maintain access to the Cape Hatteras National Seashore.  
 Thank you,  
 Joe Bunn NCBBA Life 791

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3854    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** McCabe, Keith D  
**Received:** Apr,20,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** Keith D. McCabe 46 Clermont Newport Coast, CA 92657 949-584-1775  
 04/13/2010 Mike Murray, Superintendent Cape Hatteras National Seashore 1401 National Park Drive Manteo, NC 27954  
 Dear Superintendent Murray,  
 I disagree with the NPS DEIS and its approach to resolving the open access issues for our Cape Hatteras National Seashore. I support open access. There is no scientific basis that can be used to justify the decisions that have been made or the ones that will be made in the near future. The last two years have caused many Dare County residents great hardship and has been a moral blow to the island communities. The natural state of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore must always be preserved but continuous access to the beaches and Cape Point must be insured.  
 I am a native North Carolinian and grew up along the coast of N.C. My family has been fighting developers and poor decision making regarding the use of public beaches and the ecological issues of those beaches since the 1970's. I own two properties in Buxton, N.C. for my enjoyment and the enjoyment of my family. We have flown approximately 3000 miles every year for the last 15 years to enjoy walks on the beach, fishing at the point, and to view the beautiful, Cape Hatteras National Seashore. We have also been hosts to hundreds of visitors from around the country, including many from California. They all have experienced something very special.  
 This changed two years ago when access to the point and other popular areas were closed during our visits. Beach access issues are not the only reason why many visitors decide not to visit the Cape Hatteras National Seashore. This issue has caused a tense and upsetting feeling across the entire Outer Banks and it's communities. Families, business people, fishermen, locals, nonlocals, tourist, Park Rangers, politicians, schools, restaurants, children and the list goes on, everywhere you go this issue is talked about. Visitors and tourist come here for serenity, for peace, for the love of our beaches and country. This is what they come to the Cape Hatteras National Seashore to experience.  
 Please restore continuous access to our beaches and Cape Point. Please restore the reasons why so many visitors come year after year to the Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Please. Please restore the serenity, peace and love of the island.  
 Best regards, Keith D. McCabe

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3855    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Tidd, Michele  
**Received:** Apr,19,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** Michele Tidd 5011 Church Rd. Bowie, Md. 20720  
 April 14, 2010  
 Mike Murray, Superintendent Cape Hatteras National Seashore 1401 National Park Drive Manteo, NC. 27954  
 Dear Mr. Murray,  
 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:** 3856    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Salimbene, Nicholas and Eve  
**Received:** Apr.20,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** NICHOLAS AND EVE SALIMBENE 314 DIANA DRIVE MCKEES ROCKS, PA 15136 (412) 780-4983 Ews3333@aol.com  
Mike Murray, Superintendent Cape Hatteras National Seashore 1401 National Park Drive Manteo, NC 27954  
RE: ORV driving in Frisco and Hatteras Villages  
Dear Mr, Murray. My husband and I have owned a beachfront vacation rental home in the Village of Frisco for the last 12 years. We utilize the home for vacations with family, and rent the home out through Midgett Realty about 23 weeks a year. We have loved the Outer Banks since our first visit, and hope to retire to the area within the next 5-8 years.  
I am very disturbed and concerned about the proposed plan to open the beach in front of the villages of Frisco and Hatteras to ORV driving year round. This proposal would be extremely detrimental to the pristine, family friendly beaches that lure visitors to vacation in the area. Not to mention the environmental impact on the beach, dune and wildlife.  
Last season I left a questionnaire in our home asking my renters, about 80% of whom are repeat visitors to the Outer Banks, how they would feel about beach driving in front of the cottages during the rental season, and if it would impact their decision to return to Frisco in future years. The response was a unanimous reply that they would no longer vacation in Frisco or Hatteras should driving be allowed on the beach from May through September. That response came from approximately 40 families, encompassing over 200 people. I venture to surmise that my renters are not the only ones who will no longer find the Outer Banks beaches to be their vacation destination should this proposal be implemented. Should Hatteras Island lose the vacationers, either through lack of beach access to fishing space due to wildlife restrictions or open ORV traffic in the villages year round, the already damaged economy will completely collapse. I don't think that would benefit anyone, except maybe the piping plover.  
Also of note, I was recently down at our home to prepare for the rental season, and was thrilled to see that the dune has grown considerably and is almost back to its original state after the terrible devastation during Hurricane Isabel. My home is adjacent to the right-of-way walking access to the beach and I fear that ORV driving may damage or erode the dune area, and worry that drivers may find a quick access to the street and Highway 12 by utilizing the walking pathway for their driving shortcut. Obviously, the dune is very important to the island and its homeowners, and damage to it would put all homes in jeopardy of flooding, over wash and destruction. Also, the beach to the dune line, was completely covered with water during high tide. We were unable to walk on the beach during high tide, as we would have had to walk on the dune. Where would the ORV's drive? I would say up over the dune, especially if they become trapped by the rising water.  
Our home is a family friendly, pet friendly vacation destination. Most of my renters bring their pets, children, grandchildren and relatives with them when they visit. Would it not be extremely dangerous to have vehicles, children, pets and elderly people all sharing the same small beach area? There is definitely not enough space to accommodate both people and vehicles from the water line to the dune line. I am not one who feels that the beaches in front of the villages should be closed year round for driving. It is fair to compromise with the ORV proponents, as has been the norm in previous years, and allow driving in front of the villages from October thru March. But please leave the restrictions on driving during the rental season in place for the sake of the island, the dunes, the economy, the residents, the vacationers, the wildlife, and the pristine beaches that drew my family, as well as many others to this location in the first place.  
Sincerely, Eve W. Salimbene

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3857    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Newbold, John and Sharon  
**Received:** Apr.27,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** Mr. and Mrs. John P. Newbold 2515 S. Pilot Lane Nags Head, North Carolina 27959 252-480-2453 email: fishnfools@charter.net April 25, 2010  
Superintendent Michael Murray Cape Hatteras National Seashore 1401 National Park; Drive Manteo, North Carolina 27954  
Dear Superintendent Murray:  
We have watched with disbelief as the Off-road Management Plan has been developed and is now being presented to the public as the 'best way to manage ORV usage within the park'. To me, it comes across as a very complex bird management plan, with little or no regard to the public use and enjoyment of the park.  
We are listing observations and realities of this plan we disagree with. 1. We live here on a core-bank strip of land that changes daily in size and is treated harshly by wind, waves and weather. There were never any native species here. Just as man came here, so did birds and animals. The strongest people and animals that could adapt were able to survive here. Those that did not left or died off. That is a fact of life and nature. That fact should be a part of any ORV plan. We live in an adapting and changing world.  
2. Nowhere in the 'Off-road Plan' is there any real mention of cultural and historical values of the peoples who settled here, work here and call this their home. Also completely missing and required by park protocol is any sort of economic impact statement. The plan has already and will continue to cause great financial chaos. Judge Boyle's plan has already done grave financial damage to the businesses and families who live and the course NPS is favoring is even more damaging. You are attempting to turn a national park into a bird sanctuary.  
3. The refusal of the national park to use the traditional name of the park, The Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area, in effect, is saying recreation in the park is not a prime concern at all. When the land was given to the park, the peoples of this area were promised continued traditional usage and access to the beach. With the name change came restrictive closures that were made without scientific data and statistics to support them.  
4. Our understanding was that the Off-road Plan was to be developed by a carefully screened and selected group of some thirty parties who were to be the co-authors in the formulation of the plan. NPS told all parties that participation in the group required a spirit of negotiation which would eliminate lawsuits and develop a plan by consensus and that members of the group who did not work in the spirit would be excused and replaced. Shortly after formulation of the group, three of the parties joined in a lawsuit requesting park closure to ORV's until a plan was developed. When NPS failed to replace these three parties and allowed them to continue to participate, there was no hope for any consensus, and the three parties put road block after road block on the table to derail any hope of consensus. Yet the group spent over two years working on a plan that they could never develop. This failure was the result of NPS refusing to enforce it's own rules of participation.  
5. Facing a lawsuit, NPS did nothing to defend itself in court, and this set the stage for the three parties and a very biased judge to come up with a temporary ORV plan until the final draft could be written. Park users either had to accept the plan or face full closure, and the plan was filled with closures that were not science-based and contained penalties that were imposed for violating closures. The consent decree handed down by Judge Boyle was heavy handed and did nothing to really change bird populations by NPS figures. The act of refusing to defend yourselves in court turned management of the park over to the three parties who still appear to be calling all the shots. It is obvious to me and it should be to others that NPS has little interest in doing anything except the wishes of three parties who are anti-ORV usage.  
6. NPS bird counts are flawed at best and extensive closures for birds that are not endangered is not necessary. If indeed you lay claim to dredge islands in the sound, then count the hundreds of birds who make their homes there. There are tern and skimmer colonies on these islands as well as pelicans and their numbers are impressive. Failure to include these birds gives your counts unrealistically lower numbers of species that are present here Protocol for a plover, a species of concern, is a 300 meter closure for a nest, yet NPS has established a 1000 meter dosing, almost 800 acres for one bird nest. It is

unnecessary and excessive. With NPS records to support me, there have been no predation of plover nests or chicks by OAV's in the park.

7. NPS has no right to place stakes in the water around the pond at Oregon Inlet. The basis for the action by NPS is the fact that in the sound you are allowed to fence 100 feet from shore areas. However, the pond area at the Inlet is east of the bridge and considered ocean rather than sound. The State of North Carolina clearly stipulates that waters east of the bridge fall under ocean rules and fishing laws reflect this. They should be removed now and are a clear hindrance to navigation. NPS rangers and Marine Fisheries Officers have issued warnings and tickets to anglers who were in possession of flounder and striped bass that met the sound limits but were in violation of ocean limits. You can't have two sets of conflicting rules governing the same area!

8. Birds will forage for food, gather nesting materials and mate along the beaches adjacent to the ocean, but no bird of even limited intelligence would attempt to build a nest in such a place. ORV users should easily be given corridors along the ocean to access areas for fishing. To randomly close large sections of beach to the public is not in the interest of good visitor experience. If there is a concern over user conflict between ORV's and pedestrians, it is a fabricated one. In the past ten years, only one such minor incident occurred and the driver was not blamed or charged in the incident.

9. To kill one or more species to protect another is a far cry from letting nature take its course, which is usually the position of park protocol. To kill foxes, raccoons, muskrats and other animals who live here to promote the bird population is arcane and cruel. Only the killing of over four-hundred Canadian geese by the U. S. Fish and Wildlife group is worse. Why kill a natural resource? Most plover chick predation is done by feral cats and by sea gulls. I am also surprised the environmentalists accept this action by you.

10. The turtle nest issue has gone on for so long that it is almost not worth mentioning. Bottom line, look to the management plan in Costa Rica where some of the world's best hatch rates occur, and there are even eggs allotted to the natives who wish to eat them. Why? Because they move the nest and protect the eggs! NPS protocol is to let the nest stay because moving the eggs may alter the sex of the hatchlings. But, in time of dire weather, it's suddenly OK to move them. Seems to us too many of one sex or another beats the pants off of letting the nest die because of exposure to cold water, which occurs often here. You want turtle population, MOVE THE NESTS.

11. Of the six options listed for an off-road plan, your choice of Alternative F to us is the worst possible choice. Bird populations won't change, but the effect on the peoples who live here and the visitors who come to enjoy the beach will be changed forever. The worst part of all this closure is that it is not based on science and has given no consideration to the horrific economic consequence it has already and will continue to take on the businesses that operate on the core banks.

Thanks for taking the time to listen to us. Our concerns are real, based on truth, and not influenced by third parties with their agendas or a biased judge!  
John P. Newbold Sharon R. Newbold

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3858    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Oates, Tracey

**Received:** Apr,28,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** Tracey Oates NCBBA Secretary #11240 (no address)

April 27, 2010

Cape Hatteras National Seashore Mike Murray, Superintendent 1401 National Park Drive Manteo, NC 27954

Dear Mr. Murray,

I am unable to attend any of the Public Comment Sessions so please accept this letter as my comment. I disagree with the NPS statement on p.21 0 that protected species are at risk from pedestrians and ORVs. There have been no Piping Plover deaths attributed to ORVs. ORV violations continue to decrease as signage and education improve. Pedestrian violations are much more significant than ORV violations. I do agree that ORV drivers should be required to take a NPS approved training class on beach driving.

I disagree with pedestrian only areas. This discriminates against individuals with limited Mobility, disabilities, physical impairments, families with small children and those who wish to engage in recreational activities that require equipment. I question if this is also a violation of Americans with Disabilities Act.

I disagree with the buffers proposed in the DEIS. They are excessive and should be reduced as well as provide pedestrian and ORV corridors to go around or below high tide line during entire breeding and nesting season. I agree with the following during breeding/nesting: Piping plover-50m, Wilsons Plover 30m, AMOY flush +15m, Least Tern 100m and other Colonial Waterbirds 30m. Unfledged chicks: Piping Plover 200m, Wilsons Plover 30m, AMOY flush +15m, Least Tern 30m, other Colonial Waterbirds 30m. Piping Plover unfledged chicks buffer should move with the brood as it relocates to reliable food source, not expanded.

I agree that the NPS should aggressively pursue the adaptive management initiatives identified in the DEIS and then implement less restrictive closures every year. I also agree that the NPS should create more favorable piping plover habitat by clearing vegetation at Cape Point ponds.

The DEIS inadequately addresses environmental issues more detrimental to turtles and birds. The most significant factors impacting both bird and turtle nest failures are mammalian predation, storms/lunar tides, nest abandonment, avian predation and ghost crab predation.

I disagree with the Night Driving Restrictions. There have been no Major Adverse events and human activity has not occurred frequently. Night driving deters predators lowering the risk to turtles and birds.

I do agree that the DEIS should initiate a Turtle Watch Program similar to the program used by the Alligator Wildlife Refuge at Pea Island, develop a predator management policy and adopt the proactive techniques currently used by other east locations to encourage turtle nesting success. For example: relocate nests that are in ORV corridors.

The DEIS ignores the cultural and historical importance of surf zone access to Outer Banks communities and fails to address the ethnographic study which the NPS has failed to complete. This is in violation of the NEPA process.

I disagree with the socioeconomic data and analyses in the DEIS. It is incomplete, misleading, inflated and flawed. This data included the northern beaches which significantly dilutes estimates of economic impact on the Seashore Villages. It down plays the impact on small businesses in the Seashore Villages. It does not use data from the first full year of the Consent Decree. 2008 visitors were unaware of the beach closures and were locked into reservations. Visitor counts should not include Fort Raleigh National Historic Site, The Wright Brothers National Memorial or non-federal beaches outside of the Seashore.

The DEIS is very confusing on the issue of pets. I support allowing pets on 6 foot leashes Year-round in all areas open to pedestrians or ORVs.

I disagree with and do not support ORV permit fees or limitation of permits.

I disagree with replacing wetlands for parking lots. This would not be necessary if beach was not closed to ORVs.

Thank you for taking the time to read my comments and hope that some of the suggestions make it to the FEIS.

Respectfully, Tracey Oates NCBBA Secretary # 11240

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3859    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Mr. Murray,

It has been brought to the attention of the kiteboarding community that a variety of plans are being considered in response to proposed environmental and ecological concerns. The Outer Banks of North Carolina is a sanctuary for many beach goers, sports enthusiasts, wildlife observers and most importantly, the natural environment. We, as a community, feel that it is important for the environment to be protected and thus understand certain steps may be 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 away 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 wildlife.

We strongly feel that the Historical, Cultural, and Economic ramifications of the proposed plans have not been adequately addressed by the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) as is required.

Should the environmental changes impact our communities' sport (as it would in Plans D, E, & F) we would be forced to reconsider our frequent and environmentally friendly utilization of the Outer Banks. Other user groups such as surfers, fishermen, beachcombers, and virtually all other forms of tourism will also be discouraged from visiting Cape Hatteras if beach closures are greatly expanded. This will have a severely negative impact on the local economy and way of life that the residents of Hatteras Island have enjoyed for many generations. It will also take away something that is important to the lives of thousands of people throughout the United States and around the world.

If people, and especially children, can not experience the environment how are they going to learn to help you protect the environment?

Kind Regards,

Marc-Antoine Dufour

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3860    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** RICHARDSON, HOOD  
**Received:** Apr,27,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** HOOD RICHARDSON 110 West Second Street Washington, N. C. 27889 252-975-3472  
 STATEMENT TO DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT HEARING KILL DEVIL HILLS Tuesday April 27, 2010  
 I am Hood Richardson, a Beaufort County Commissioner. I was the lead Beaufort County Commissioner in the OLF law suit. This was also a National Environmental (NEPA) issue. The Federal Government wanted 30,000 acres of prime farm land. The purpose of NEPA is to protect the public from ham fisted solutions. The burden is on the National Park Service to prove that what they want to do is the minimum reasonable effort to accomplish their desired protection. The National Park Service and the various environmental groups failed to act in a reasonable and assertive manner over many years. Now, they want to use their imperial authority to force the public not to use our beaches at all. That is not reasonable at any time and especially under NEPA.  
 I urge the decision makers to form a policy that promotes beach access. I endorse the no action alternative, but knowing some kind of action is forth coming, I like the recommendations from the Coalition for Beach Access. They provide for reasonable environmental protection while allowing for the use of the beaches and water by the public.  
 K

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3861    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 09:39:13  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** My greatest concern is the socioeconomic impact Hatteras Island is facing due to the DEIS.  
 The socioeconomic data and analyses in the DEIS (pg 270-281; 561-698) 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; 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.  
 The ROI incorporated the Northern Beach communities, including Southern Shores and Duck. These areas are disconnected from ORV use and access issues relating to the Seashore. The economic impact analysis to the Seashore Villages seems to be significantly down played. 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 the small businesses in the Seashore Villages rather than by overall economic interests within the greater ROI.  
 The DEIS does not use economic analyses data from the first year of the Consent Decree (2009). Many visitors during 2008 were not aware of the scope of the Consent Decree beach closures.  
 There is no actual business survey data in the DEIS only model projections for the economic impact for Seashore Village businesses.  
 There is no data pertaining to the loss of land value home owners will face.  
 In closing I beg you to visualize the whole scope of this issue. I am a summer home owner who adores Hatteras Island not only for the ability to drive on the beach but the many different spices of animals and the beautiful people who call the island home. Their lives are being taken away from them, animal and human. 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 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 on the DEIS.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3862    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Saunders, Ron and Cecilia  
**Received:** Apr,27,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** Ron and Cecilia Saunders Virginia Beach, VA Kill Devil Hills, N.C.  
 Dear Mike Murray,  
 Please find here written, a few pictures, as we believe pictures tell a lot. The pictures are of our home in Virginia Beach. They are current or recent. There are the ones of our Robin with her eggs nesting in the wreath on our front door. There are the ones of our chickadee family raising their babies in the house on our rear deck. There are the Mallards raising their babies in the back yard and the geese and "Whiskers the Muskrat" (Nutria) who figured if it was good for the ducks, he would give it a try. We have had many others, Birds, Turtles (nests), Rabbits (nests) and yes, the snakes. Some prey on others as you know. However, they all feel safe and secure in their relationship with us. We are good neighbors, not the enemy. This is our "best available science". It should be considered in conjunction with the other science, don't you think?  
 We hope you will understand that we take it personally when we are condemned by environmental groups because we want to continue the traditional use of the beach at CHNSS.  
 You will also find a picture of our granddaughter experiencing the wonders of Cape Hatteras. She is the next of several generations. We have had four generations together on this wonderful beach, which would not be possible anywhere else.  
 My wife and I have worked hard all our lives in the hope to one day soon be able to retire to the outer Banks. We want to be able to finally enjoy the beaches as we have dreamed of for so long. We see our dreams fading. We put our faith in you, you are our hope.  
 We realize there is a need for more regulation than there has been in the past. We are all for it. We were just on the beach last Saturday, 4/24, cleaning it. We had to ask a couple to leash their dogs, which they did. They were very receptive when we explained why it was necessary. We cleaned up trash from visitors as well as debris from storms. We were happy to do this as we want to be good stewards of God's gifts. We even pulled someone that got stuck @Ramp 4. We tried to educate the couple to the ways of beach driving. We believe that through cooperation everyone's goals can be achieved. We don't feel the good majority should be punished due to the actions of a few who do not understand. But, we have just begun to really educate people in this situation. It will get better with the proper effort.  
 We thank you,  
 Ron and Cecilia Saunders Virginia Beach, VA Kill Devil Hills, N.C. NCBBA OBPA

**Correspondence ID:** 3863    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Shea, Jack  
**Received:** Apr,27,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** Jack Shea (no address provided)  
Comments on the DEIS Corridors By Jack Shea My name is Jack Shea.  
The beaches of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area should be open and accessible to the people. Access to our public lands is a fundamental right that was promised in the enabling legislation that created America's first national seashore.  
However, this access to our public lands is severely restricted in Alternative F of the DEIS. I am here tonight to ask the National Park Service to seriously consider the role of corridors as a practical means to give us access to our public lands in a way that does not hurt wildlife. Corridors need only be small paths around a resource closure to provide access to an area that would otherwise be blocked.  
In some cases, these corridors can go through or around closures.  
In many places, a corridor can easily be established below the high tide line. Since unfledged chicks are not found in this area, it is a perfect solution to providing access in a way that does not negatively affect wildlife.  
As outlined in DEIS pages, roman numeral 12 and 17, and on page 468, corridors are only allowed in Management Level 2 portions of SMA's. Even these limited corridors are subject to resource or safety closures at any time.  
Corridors are effective tools for access and should be established throughout the entire seashore including the highly restrictive Management Level 1 portions of SMA's.  
Please remember in preparing your final Environmental Impact Statement that Corridors provide valuable access to federal lands without impairment or damage to protected resources.  
Corridors are a practical way to enhance the visitor experience and open up popular areas like Oregon Inlet and Cape Point  
Corridors are a common sense solution that represents a win-win situation for wildlife and for "we the people."  
Thank you for your consideration of, my comments.

**Correspondence ID:** 3864    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Shea, Jack  
**Received:** Apr,28,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** Jack Shea (no address)  
Comments on the DEIS Piping Plover Buffers By Jack Shea  
My name is Jack Shea.  
There are many aspects of the DEIS that I find objectionable -  
However, tonight I would like to focus your attention on the extreme buffers given to piping plover unfledged chicks asoutlined on pages 121 to 124 of the DEIS.  
Alternative F requires a minimum 1,000 meter buffer in all directions. This represents a linear distance 2,000 meters or 6,561 feet. Or, expressed in miles it is 1.24 miles. This gigantic buffer is equivalent to the following ?  
? 40 Olympic size swimming pools ? 18 Professional football fields ? 6 Nimitz class aircraft carriers  
What if these extreme closures were imposed on our decision makers in Washington, D.C., instead of the people at the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area?  
For example, a nest of unfledged piping plover chicks inthe middle of the National Mall surrounded by the Smithsonian buildings, would shut down the entire area.  
The closure would extend all the way from the Grant memorial on the west lawn of the U.S. Capitol all the way to the Washington monument.  
Furthermore, someone standing in the middle of Pennsylvania Avenue in front of the White House is closer to the Oval Office than a family can get to a piping plover nest while on the beaches of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area. Here we see that a non-endangered bird gets a larger protective buffer than the President of the United States.  
These comparisons to geography in Washington, D.C. are important because the National Park Service and the Department of Interior need to understand precisely what would happen if these regulations were imposed in their recreational area, in their backyard.  
More consistent with the species recovery plan would be a protective buffer of 200 meters. This would still provide a quarantine area of one-quarter mile, or 8 Olympic size swimming pools.  
The purpose of protective buffers is to facilitate the recovery of the species. This can be accomplished with 200 meter buffers that have proven to be effective elsewhere, including other federal lands.  
Bottom line, there is no justification for 1,000 meter buffers in the DEIS. This should be changed in Alternative F in favor of a more practical and effective 200 meter buffer.  
Thank you for your consideration of my comments.

**Correspondence ID:** 3865    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** mckay, starr  
**Received:** May,06,2010 09:45:19  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I live and work on ocracoke. My children lopve going to school here. If the beaches were shut down it would take away the lively hood of this whole town. It would turn into a ghost town people come here to fish ride horses on the beach, sit with there dogs out at the beach with their family. This is going to cause major economical disaster (like the oil spill in the gulf) to this island to all of the Outer Banks. Why should the plover be more important than the peoples well being that live here.

**Correspondence ID:** 3866    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** May,06,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Mr. Murray,  
It has been brought to the attention of the kiteboarding community that a variety of plans are being considered in response to proposed environmental and ecological concerns. The Outer Banks of North Carolina is a sanctuary for many beach goers, sports enthusiasts, wildlife observers and most importantly, the natural environment. We, as a community, feel that it is important for the environment to be protected and thus understand certain steps may be 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 away 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 wildlife.  
We strongly feel that the Historical, Cultural, and Economic ramifications of the proposed plans have not been adequately addressed by the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) as is required.

Should the environmental changes impact our communities' sport (as it would in Plans D, E, & F) we would be forced to reconsider our frequent and environmentally friendly utilization of the Outer Banks. Other user groups such as surfers, fishermen, beachcombers, and virtually all other forms of tourism will also be discouraged from visiting Cape Hatteras if beach closures are greatly expanded. This will have a severely negative impact on the local economy and way of life that the residents of Hatteras Island have enjoyed for many generations. It will also take away something that is important to the lives of thousands of people throughout the United States and around the world.

If people, and especially children, can not experience the environment how are they going to learn to help you protect the environment?

Kind Regards, Mike Broekhoven Kingston, Ontario, Canada

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3867	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	
<b>Name:</b>	Smith, Ernie					
<b>Received:</b>	Apr,28,2010 00:00:00					
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Letter					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Ernie Smith 2707 Ridge Road Wilson, NC 27896 April 28, 2010 Mike Murray, Superintendent Cape Hatteras National Seashore 1401 National Park Drive Manteo, NC 27954 Re: Comment on Draft ORY Management Plan (DEIS) Dear Superintendent Murray: I strongly support and agree with the Coalition for Beach Access* Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area ORV Access Environmental Impact Position Statement dated March 5, 2010. ,*American Sportfishing Association *Avon Property Owners Association *Cape Hatteras Anglers Club *North Carolina Beach Buggy Association *Outer Banks Preservation Association *United Mobile Sportsfishermen ?*Watersports Industry Association, Inc. *Outer Banks Chamber of Commerce (April 6. 2010) Respectfully, Ernie Smith 2707 Ridge Road Wilson, NC 27896					
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3868	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	
<b>Name:</b>	Burke, Thomas P					
<b>Received:</b>	Apr,22,2010 00:00:00					
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Letter					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I disagree with the following points in Alternative F: 1) No vehicle access corridor at Bodie Island spit during the shore bird breeding season 2) Vehicle free areas in non breeding areas 3) Relocating ramp 2 further south 4) Vehicle carrying capacity at Bodie Island (too limited). 5) Permit system 6) Buffers are way to long 7) Night driving restrictions to large 8) Pea Island is not even recognized ? it should be opened up for ORV use 9) Ramp 1 is closed. It should be opened to Coquina Beach 10) New inter-dunal road to the Bait Pond on Bodie Island. Should be open to ORV's.					
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3869	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b> Y
<b>Name:</b>	private					
<b>Received:</b>	May,06,2010 09:53:02					
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Surf Fishing and responsible ORV use by friends and family for the past 30yrs at CHNS will live on in my mind forever. Since the inception of the consent decree these "memories" are basically all that remain. I have cancelled trips to CHNS and will not return. Responsible, caring, outdoor enthusiasts have been punished due to the political rhetoric and lies spread by the groups pursuing this frivolous lawsuit. I vehemently oppose NPS' Preferred Alternative F and support the well-reasoned Coalition for Beach Access recommendations.					
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3870	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	
<b>Name:</b>	Zacharias, Walter M					
<b>Received:</b>	Apr,22,2010 00:00:00					
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Letter					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	4/17/10 Walter M. Zacharias Cleveland, Ohio Dear Mr. Murray, I want to express my feverent (sp) hope & desire for the continuance of & maintenance of access to Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational area. I believe that the federal government and the environmentalists have greatly exaggerated the threat posed to wild life by ORV driving on the beach. And that the current rules make it unreasonably difficult to get to traditionally popular fishing areas. Area businesses detest the restrictions too, citing reduced spending by CRV users. Sincerely, Walter M. Zacharias Cleveland, Ohio					
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3871	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b> Y
<b>Name:</b>	private					
<b>Received:</b>	May,06,2010 00:00:00					
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Mr. Murray, It has been brought to the attention of the kiteboarding community that a variety of plans are being considered in response to proposed environmental and ecological concerns. The Outer Banks of North Carolina is a sanctuary for many beach goers, sports enthusiasts, wildlife observers and most importantly, the natural environment. We, as a community, feel that it is important for the environment to be protected and thus understand certain steps may be 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 away 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 wildlife. We strongly feel that the Historical, Cultural, and Economic ramifications of the proposed plans have not been adequately addressed by the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) as is required. Should the environmental changes impact our communities' sport (as it would in Plans D, E, & F) we would be forced to reconsider our frequent and environmentally friendly utilization of the Outer Banks. Other user groups such as surfers, fishermen, beachcombers, and virtually all other forms of					

tourism will also be discouraged from visiting Cape Hatteras if beach closures are greatly expanded. This will have a severely negative impact on the local economy and way of life that the residents of Hatteras Island have enjoyed for many generations. It will also take away something that is important to the lives of thousands of people throughout the United States and around the world.

If people, and especially children, can not experience the environment how are they going to learn to help you protect the environment?

Kind Regards,

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3872    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Walker, Lewis and Ellen  
**Received:** Apr,26,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** Lewis D. & Ellen G. Walker 101 Mill View Lane Newtown Square, PA 19073  
 April 25, 2010  
 Mr. Mike Murray, Superintendent Cape Hatteras National Seashore 140 I National Park Drive Manteo, NC 27954  
 Re: National Park Service Proposed Rules for Beach Access in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement ("DEIS")  
 Dear Mr. Murray:  
 We are writing in response to the aforementioned DEIS which is scheduled to become effective at year-end. We are very disappointed with the six alternative plans presented, especially Alternative F, to which we would assign the same grade.  
 We have vacationed in Avon, NC since 1978. We have been property owners since 1996. We have made many friends over the years and have had many renters return to our home each summer. The biggest draw for our tenants has been the natural beauty of the seashore, the abundant fishing and uncrowded beaches. These are exactly the reasons why so many in our area avoid the New Jersey and Delaware shores.  
 The vacationers and property owners alike, contribute much money to the local Outer Banks economy through their spending on food, charter fishing, equipment sales and rentals and real estate and occupancy taxes. Many of our friends in Avon, rely exclusively on the visitors who return each summer. This DEIS will do nothing to increase the number of visitors to our Island. In fact, it will do quite the opposite.  
 The draconian restrictions imposed by Alternative F will not make anybody but a few militant nature extremist happy. Transforming the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area from a recreational destination into a wildlife sanctuary with no human encroachment is a terrible idea. The loss of jobs, the decrease in visitor spending and the loss of both real estate taxes (certainly the home values will have to be reduced significantly) and visitor taxes will have a devastating impact on Hatteras Island.  
 If the goal of Alternative F of the DEIS is to return Hatteras Island to its primitive long ago past, it will do that. If we are to maintain Hatteras Island as the pristine, uncluttered destination desired by so many, Alternative F must be rejected. It would appear Alternative F, the preferred option of the National Park Service, is an easy out for the NPS- far more restrictive than anything decreed or proposed thus far. So, please say no to Alternative F.  
 Thank you.  
 Sincerely Lewis D. & Ellen G. Walker

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3873    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Wells, Robert C  
**Received:** Apr,28,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** Robert C. Wells 3315 Brooklane Wilson, NC 27896  
 Mike Murray, Superintendent Cape Hatteras National Seashore 1401 National Park Drive Manteo, NC 27954  
 April 28, 2010  
 Re: Comment on Draft ORV Management Plan (OEIS)  
 Dear Superintendent Murray: I strongly support and agree with the Coalition for Beach Access? Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area ORV Access Environmental Impact Position Statement dated March 5, 2010.  
 \*American Sportfishing Association \*Avon Property Owners Association \*Cape Hatteras Anglers Club \*North Carolina Beach Buggy Association  
 \*Outer Banks Preservation Association \*United Mobile Sportsfishermen \*Watersports Industry Association, Inc. \*Outer Banks Chamber of Commerce (April 6, 2010)  
 Respectfully, Robert C Wells

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3874    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Tine, Paul N  
**Received:** May,06,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Mike Murray, Superintendent Cape Hatteras National Seashore 1401 National Park Drive Manteo, NC 27954  
 Dear Supt. Murray:  
 The Outer Banks Chamber of Commerce, on behalf of its more than 1,000 members with businesses in Dare, Hyde and Currituck counties, vehemently disagrees with the validity of the economic impact analysis included in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for proposed new rules for access to the Cape Hatteras National Seashore.  
 Not only does the analysis not adequately convey the economic impact of the proposed Alternative F, it fails to address any of the alternatives listed in the DEIS. The data is incomplete, misleading and the statements of what are supposed to be facts are without sound basis. The area is unique because it is removed from any large populations and has limited transportation infrastructure. These two points translate into a very high cost of living which gained no mention in the DEIS.  
 Part of the problem of the economic impact analysis seems to be that its authors lack familiarity with the area.  
 Dare County, the largest county in the state, includes 1584 square miles, of which only 384 square miles are land; the remaining area encompasses a large portion of the Pamlico Sound. Although there are six municipalities and an unincorporated portion of the county, only about 25 square miles -- 16,000 acres -- are both suitable for development and in private ownership. The remaining land is held in conservation by nonprofits or owned government entities - primarily US Fish and Wildlife Service and the National Park Service. Thus, approximately 6.5 percent of the county's buildable land area is used to support approximately 30,000 residents.  
 The Dare County portion of the Outer Banks stretches about 80 miles from north to south. Each of the towns, as well as the villages in the Cape Hatteras National Seashore, has a distinct personality and socioeconomic make-up ranging from wealthy retirees in the towns of Duck and Southern Shores in the northern part of the county to Hatteras village, a commercial fishing village, on the south end of Hatteras Island. Access to Hatteras Island is limited to NC 12 from the north, a ferry that runs between Hatteras and Ocracoke islands, and a small landing field.  
 Ocracoke Village in Hyde County also is unique in geographic as well as socioeconomic character. Located on the 16-mile-long Ocracoke Island, the village is situated on approximately 600 acres of buildable land. The remainder of the island is owned by the federal government and is part of the national seashore. The only access is by ferry, boat or small plane. Although Ocracoke village is home to only 10 to 15 percent of Hyde County's population, it provides approximately 50 percent of the tax revenue for the entire county, the bulk of which is on the mainland.  
 The primary product of the region is both simple and unique. The environment, history and culture of the area are intricately woven together into a tapestry that makes up what is in effect the largest outdoor interactive museum in the world. Deficiencies in the economic impact analysis:  
 1. Page 566 in the DEIS states "To provide information for the economic analysis, a survey was conducted by RTI, International of selected categories of potentially affected businesses. The results of this survey are currently being analyzed and will be addressed in the final plan/EIS." Page 571 also notes that data is still being analyzed and will allow future analysis of the economic impact. How is it possible to comment on something that does not yet exist? 2. Page 566, table 63 uses what it purports to be revenues from 2004 when current data was available. And the revenues in the table are

incorrect even for 2004 and don't appear to include Ocracoke village.

3. Page 568 uses "visitation" statistics reported annually by the National Park Service. These statistics are based on traffic counts, the amount of which is then multiplied by a formula. There is no way to know if vehicles have five passengers or just a driver or whether they are even a visitor. The formula utilized doesn't take into account events such as high numbers of construction vehicles in the area due to storm damage or other extraordinary events. Attempts often are made to use the gross occupancy tax collected as a method to determine the number of visitors, however, there are numerous confounders that negate this from being a reasonable barometer for visitation. There is no valid way to count visitors on the seashore and the only gauge of impacts available is current data such as unemployment, increases/decreases in government aid, etc. in a given locality.

4. Page 595, table 80. There is no logical basis for this table and it seems to attempt to dilute impact by including all portions of Hyde and Dare counties. And there appears to be no basis for the footnote that states that 54 percent of the direct impact is expected occur in the Seashore villages. Obviously direct impact is going to be felt most by those in the seashore and it will be substantially more than 54 percent.

5. Page 595. "This uncertainty may impact small businesses disproportionately." By Small Business Administration's definition almost all of the businesses in the seashore are small businesses.

6. Page 56. "This alternative would involve the construction of a pedestrian access trail and improvements and additions to the interdunal road system." Page 80. "...by improving interdunal road and ORV ramp access. Pedestrian access would be enhanced by providing increased parking capacity at various points of access to vehicle-free areas..." Page 81. "would include the construction of a short ORV route to access a new pedestrian trail to the sound on Ocracoke Island..." Page 593. "...additional pedestrian and ORV access would be facilitated by construction and relocation of access ramps, and the designation of ORV access corridors at Cape Point and South Point." Page 598. "The extra efforts to increase ORV access and pedestrian access should increase the probability that the impacts are on the low rather than high end of the range." The inclusion of these forward-looking statements is troublesome. There is no appropriation in the NPS budget through 2011 for these plans so they should not be used to imply that they will minimize economic impact. Furthermore, given the inherent unpredictability of each future budgetary cycle after FY 2011, it would be difficult or impossible to quantify any economic impact of these improvements given the likelihood they will be implemented over an unknown term and are likely subject to additional modification dependent on future budgetary constraints. Leaving these statements in the DEIS or using them as a basis to determine/predict/minimize economic impact could raise questions about compliance with the Antideficiency Act described on Page 40. 7. In the beginning of the DEIS, there is a list of federal rules, policies, etc. that the DEIS must comply with. Missing from this list is compliance with the Regulatory Flexibility Act which requires "federal agencies to consider the effects of their regulatory actions on small businesses and other small entities and to minimize any undue disproportionate burden." The economic impact analysis in this document does not comply with that and thus should not be certified.

8. There has been no obvious attempt to gauge indirect impact. Because they are in small, semi-isolated communities, businesses in the seashore villages must depend to varying degrees on vendors outside the area for supplies and services. Any decrease in visitors in the villages translates into a decrease for their chosen purveyors. Also ignored is that any negative financial impact in the seashore villages in Dare County translates into decreased revenues from a county-wide occupancy tax which is shared by the six municipalities and the county. A decrease in the amount collected on Hatteras Island reflects in the amount of the pool that is divided amongst the local governments. In Hyde County, the importance of the revenues generated in Ocracoke village can not be overstated. The small village is the economic engine of the rural county which is among the poorest in the state. Any decrease in revenues translates into further straining budgets for schools, emergency personnel and other critical services provided and/or funded by the county.

9. Since the implementation of the Consent Decree, there have been documented impacts to the seashore villages that are verifiable and should be included in any economic analysis related to the DEIS and its proposed alternative. Although the country is in a nationwide economic downturn and gas prices have added to the woes, Hatteras Island has had disproportionate adverse impacts compared to the rest of the county. The following data should be included in the economic analysis related to the implementation of the Consent Decree:

In September 2009, (the first full year under the Consent Decree) the beginning of the prime fall fishing season ? Dare County as a whole experienced an unemployment rate of 6.8 percent, one of the lowest in the state, but when the North Carolina Division of Labor Marketing broke the unemployment down to zip codes it showed that Hatteras Island's villages had extraordinary unemployment. The island as a whole had 12.8 percent unemployment. When broken down to the villages, Salvo was at 28 percent; Buxton 16.5 percent; and Rodanthe was 12.4. According to data provided by the Dare County Social Services, in 2009, the first full year under the Consent Decree, the Hatteras Island increase in individuals applying for food stamps was 81.6 percent over 2008. The remainder of Dare [north of Oregon Inlet] 56.6 percent, and the countywide 59.3 percent. In October 2009, Cape Hatteras United Methodist Men's Emergency Assistance and Food Pantry reported that requests for food and other assistance in the seashore villages were continuing to rise. In 2008, the group paid out \$56,000 the entire year to help with utility bills, rent, etc.. but in 2009, the amount was surpassed before the end of October.

Other issues of concern

10. Page 58. "Beach access points and boardwalks compliant with the American with Disabilities Act requirements would be provided at Coquina Beach, the Frisco Boathouse, the Ocracoke Pony Pen and the Ocracoke day use area...Beach wheelchairs could be checked out at each district on a first-come, first-served basis." These statements raise the same issues as those listed in item 6 above. In addition, if the projects are removed from the alternative chosen, it then raises questions about compliance with the Architectural Barriers Act of 1968 and the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990. A large number of commenters at the recent public hearings specifically expressed concerns about those with disabilities and others who have an inability to walk long distances and would no longer be able to enjoy the seashore, particularly those who fish. 11. In March of this year, "A Review and Synthesis of the Scientific Information Related to the Biology and Management of Species of Special Concern at Cape Hatteras National Seashore, North Carolina" by authors Jonathan B. Cohen, R. Michael Erwin, John B. French, Jr., Jeffrey L. Marion, and J. Michael Meyers was published by the U.S. Geological Survey's Patuxent Wildlife Research Center (PWRC) which conducted the original study at the National Park Service's request in 2005. According to the published report's summary, the intention was to "review, evaluate, and summarize the available scientific information for selected species of concern at CAHA (piping plovers, sea turtles, seabach amaranth, American oystercatchers, and colonial waterbirds). This work consisted of reviewing the scientific literature and evaluating the results of studies that examined critical life history stages of each species, and focused on the scientific findings reported that are relevant to the management of these species and their habitats at CAHA...Although no new original research or experimental work was conducted, this synthesis of the existing information was peer reviewed by over 15 experts with familiarity with these species...To ensure that the best available information is considered when assessing each species of interest at CAHA, this review included published research as well as practical experience of scientists and wildlife managers who were consulted in 2005. PWRC scientists evaluated the literature, consulted wildlife managers, and produced an initial draft that was sent to experts for scientific review. Revisions based on those comments were incorporated into the

document. The final draft of the document was reviewed by NPS personnel to ensure that the description of the recent status and management of these species at CAHA was accurately represented and that the report was consistent with our work agreement..." The document has been at the center of controversy since first referenced during the negotiated rule-making process. There are continuing questions about whether it was peer reviewed per the USGS guidelines and although the published version states that there is no new science or additions to it, there are a number of changes that are referenced as being the result of research that occurred after the original document was produced. Questioned about the peer review process, a spokesperson for USGS responded that the acknowledgments at the end of each chapter of the original document was actually the list of those who peer reviewed that particular section. Calls to some of those listed as such said that they had never seen the document and therefore had not peer reviewed it. Those acknowledgments are not at the ends of the chapters in the published version of the report. Federal environmental regulations are to be based on best available science, yet the process to ensure that seems to be missing in this instance. This matter should be referred to the Department of Interior Inspector General with a request that the science we reviewed and that an investigation be conducted to determine if in fact the USGS complied with its own peer review guidelines. 12. The Outer Banks Chamber of Commerce supports the adoption of Alternative A - aka the Interim Plan. Under the plan there was negligible economic impact, however, there was an increase in piping plovers that was clearly demonstrated by increased numbers in 2007 and in 2008. In the latter year, the Consent Decree went into effect but not until after the nesting season was underway. In 2009, the first full year under the decree, the numbers actually declined. This alternative was based on science and balanced access by the public with protection of the wildlife.

Sincerely,

Paul N. Tine, Chairman Outer Banks Chamber of Commerce Board of Directors

**Correspondence ID:** 3875    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Wheless, Karen  
**Received:** Apr.28.2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** Karen Wheless 103 Ransdell Road Louisburg, NC 27549 Phone: 919-818-9019 Email: ksw4obx@gmail.com  
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 -Moot 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 call 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 social-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 any 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:** 3876    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Burrus, Allen  
**Received:** Apr.26.2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:**

Corridors are a vital tool in providing access while managing resources. They provide a small path around temporary resource closures in order to provide access to an open area that would otherwise be blocked. In some instances, corridors can be made through or around closure areas. In other places corridors can be established below the high tide line. Since unfledged chicks are not found in nests between the ocean and the high tide line, this type of pass through corridor would have no negative effect on wildlife. In the DEIS, as outlined on pages xii, xvii, 468- Corridors are only allowed in Management Level 2 portions of SMA's. These corridors while theoretically possible, are subject to resource or safety closures at any time. I believe Corridors should be maintained for pedestrians and ORV's in all areas of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area. Corridors should be established throughout the entire breeding and nesting season. Corridors should be provided in all areas of the seashore, including the highly restrictive Management Level 1 portions of SMA's required under Alternative F. Corridors will provide valuable access without impairment or damage to protected resources. I believe people and nature can live in harmony and that science-based resource protection can be balanced with providing

recreational access.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3877    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Burrus, Allen  
**Received:** Apr.26,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** Buffers, or closures, are important management practices for species recovery. However, to benefit the protected species & the visiting public, all buffers must be based on peer-reviewed science. Once buffers are established, they must be routinely monitored throughout the breeding season to ensure that resources are effectively protected and public access is provided. The extreme buffers outlined in DEIS pages 121 to 127 must be modified in the final version of the Environmental Impact Statement. The 1,000 meter buffer for Piping Plover, required in Alternative F, is excessive and punitive and not based on peer reviewed science. This 1,000 meter buffer can only be fully appreciated when it is understood that this is a minimum distance that is required in all directions of the nest of unfledged chicks or on a linear distance it is 1< miles. A more appropriate and yet effective buffer is 200 meters. Ample scientific evidence and precedent exists (i.e. Piping Plover Recovery Act) to support a 200 meter buffer. As part of the NEPA process, I formally request the National Park Service to provide peer-reviewed science that justifies a 1,000 meter closure in all directions. Buffers for other species, including American Oystercatchers, Least Terns and Colonial Waterbirds must also be changed. A 30 meter buffer should be established for these birds rather than the 300 meters outlined in the DEIS.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3878    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** unknown, unknown  
**Received:** Apr.26,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** Grasses For years I have seen grasses planted only to be destroyed by high tides. Grass will not survive in the area due to nature and nature will prevail. Wildlife (Reference to as species eradication) This is and always has been their natural habitat yet you choose to try and remove them or euthanize them in order to attempt to get a bird to establish a habitat here. If this was natural for these birds they would have been here for many years and would not have to be forced. 1 After year of attempting to get these birds to come here, we have yet to know the true story of survival rate but what we hear is very low. Water has been allowed to stand in areas where wildlife would live during the winter. Maybe your way of getting rid of wildlife. In years past that area would be drained. Finally the Permit We all know that was what this would work up to. Pay to use what is already yours! Economy at its worse, some people can't afford gas for their wheels or food for the table. How many birds do you estimate this will save? (1) How about Pee Island or Portsmouth Island as a more practical place for birds and other wildlife? (2) Why penalize the people in this room for going into restricted areas without proof of who make the infraction. What if someone in the other side did it to make us look guilty? Nothing should be done until guilt is proven!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3879    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.06,2010 10:15:24  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please respect the beaches, the economy, and the way of life that is the Outer Banks of North Carolina by choosing Alternative C - Seasonal Management plan in the off-road vehicle management plan. If there is to be public/private cooperation and a healthy approach that gets the most accomplished with regards to wildlife management, environmental protections, and endangered species management, the best approach is the one least intrusive into the way of life already existing there. Other plans seem to border on destructive to those already there, making a living, and living in an isolated area that needs to be managed with all concerns in mind.  
The number of Piping Plover nests are increasing throughout the United States. It is not appropriate at this time to take draconian measures to enhance a small segment of the species' nesting range. Small incremental enhancements are beneficial to the environment as well as the overall way of life there. Should any of the other plans become the enforceable law of the Outer Banks region I'll never visit again. Please don't make the same types of mistakes with the outer banks of North Carolina that have been made in Yellowstone Park by over-managing this valuable resource.  
Sincerely, Dave Thomas

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3880    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Goodwin, David  
**Received:** Apr.26,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** Comment by David Goodwin, Buxton, NC On behalf of Cape Hatteras Business Allies  
My name is David Goodwin & I am speaking on behalf of the Cape Hatteras Business Allies, which represented the businesses on Hatteras & Ocracoke Islands during the negotiated rulemaking process.  
I have been coming to Hatteras Island since the mid 1950s. I have lived here for 11 years. My father bought a house in Hatteras Village in 1962 since he had decided that that end of the island provided the best fishing experience for him.  
In the NPS Preferred Alternative in the DEIS, I note with dismay that the beaches of Hatteras Inlet, on the Hatteras Island side, have been designated a SMA. This designatio prohibits all entry into the inlet area by ALL persons, whether in ORVs or on foot permanently. This designation removes one of the most sought-after fishing & recreating areas of the Seashore from any public use.  
While Oregon Inlet spit & South Point both share some similarities with Hatteras Inlet, there is no other area within the Seashore that provides for diverse activities like Hatteras Inlet. There, you can fish, swim, sunbathe, play volleyball & many other activities. It is a very family-friendly beach, particularly on the sound side. Not every visitor wants to recreate on the ocean side with its pounding waves & sometimes strong winds & blowing sands. The "Rip" is a well known fishing spot that attracts fishermen from all over the country. It is well known & well loved by many. So visitors & residents alike will only fish in this area & make annual pilgrimages to take advantage of its offerings.  
In Hatteras Village itself are many businesses that rely on visitor use of the beach. There are tackle shops, beach equipment rentals, general merchandise stores that cater to beachgoers, motels, campgrounds & rental housing providers. All of these businesses in some form or fashion depend on access to the beaches for their livelihood, particularly access to the Hatteras Inlet area. To close this area permanently to human use will severely impact these businesses. People drive by many good beaches to come to this Seashore. With Hatteras Inlet removed from human access, most of these visitors will go elsewhere. This will impat the local businesses adversely & diminish the visitor experience, particularly those with babies & young children.  
Cape Hatteras Business Allies recommends that the Park Service reconsider its permanent closure of Hatteras Inlet. We recommend changing the designation to one that will allow access to this area on at least a seasonal basis. The interior used for foraging can be permanently closed for shorebird use. But the soundside & "Rip" areas along the shoreline need to be opened to the public. This should include ORV use, as many visitors & residents cannot walk long distances with a load of fishing/recreating equipment. This usage of Hatteras Inlet has been ongoing for many decades & has not resulted in any major disturbance of wildlife use in the area. In fact, PPL usage of the this area has been non-existent since 2006 (Table 20, pg.199 DEIS)  
Thank you for your time.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3881    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Burrus, Jennifer  
**Received:** Apr.26,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** Addressing DEIS page numbers 121-127: Buffers are important management practices for species recovery. However, for the buffers to be a success and to have long term benefits for the wildlife, buffers must be based on peer-reviewed science. As a recent college graduate from the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, I understand the importance of protecting the wildlife on Hatteras Island. I also understand the necessity of having adequate research to support such laws. I challenge the National Park Service to investigate and study what they plan to implement. Where are the statistics proving this DEIS will greatly benefit the wildlife at the expense of the economic welfare of the residents of Hatteras Island? The buffers suggested here are much larger than what is required by your own species recovery plans. ? For example, Piping Plover unfledged chicks, are given a protective buffer of a minimum of 1,000 meters in all directions.  
? The Piping Plover, a species classified as threatened and not endangered, is given a level of unprecedented protection in Alternative F. The DEIS does not cite any researched-based science in supporting such closure. A more appropriate & effective buffer would be 200 meters.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3882    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Jordan, Lynn  
**Received:** Apr,26,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** I have read Plan F of the DEIS and hope it will be revised to consider the original purpose of this recreational seashore as stated by the federal government when the land was acquired in 1937.  
SUBCHAPTER LXIII ? NATIONA SEASHORE RECREATIONAL AREA (CH. 459, SEC. 1, 54 STAT. 702)  
"?.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 Recreation Area?"  
Wildlife preservation is important to the citizens here. Birds can be protected on approximately 20 miles of Hatteras Island without closing any ORV access ramps. Birds can also fly to hundreds of barrier islands in the Pamlico Sound, where their nests are less likely to be disturbed by predators. Nests discovered on open beaches can be roped off for protection as they were prior to 2008 (DEIS p.24).  
Turtle nests can be roped off as well or eggs could be moved to Pea Island Wildlife Refuge. Eggs are only moved now prior to storms, which have proven to be more detrimental to hatchlings than ORVs. (DEIS p.87, p. 119, p. 125, p. 392-396)  
Under a revised Plan F, the villages of Hatteras Island could be restored to their original purpose as recreational areas open to ORV use by the public. This would assure the NPS of compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, which is questionable under Plan F. (DEIS p.1) It would be a show of support by the NPS for the socioeconomic growth of the island, which cannot survive without ORV access. The NPS would be displaying its' respect for the traditions, culture and history of Hatteras Island, not considered in Plan F. And the NPS would be honoring the federal governments original contract with the people.  
Please consider a revision to Plan F that the citizens of Hatteras Island can support. This is the perfect opportunity to restore good human relations between the PNS and the people. We have worked together so diligently in the past to preserve wildlife and accommodate vacationers. Hatteras Island is dependent on tourism to survive economically! The main attraction to tourists here are the ORV access ramps to the beach. Without ORV access to the beaches, tourists will not come here and the economy of Hatteras Island will die.  
Respectfully, Lynn Jordan P.O. Box 734 ? Rodanthe, NC 27968

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3883    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Cohen, Mary Ann  
**Received:** Apr,26,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** Public Comment April 26, 2010 Mary Ann Cohen Salvo, NC  
Page 284 of the DEIS states "Recreational fishing is a significant part of N.C.'s economy, attracting spending from both local and out-of-state anglers." With the restrictions for ORV in the DEIS how will recreational fishing continue to help the NC economy?  
Page 482 of DEIS states the NPS Organic Act directs national parks to conserve wildlife for future generations and to protect native animal life as part of the park unit's natural ecosystem. Does trapping and killing native mammals protect them?

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3884    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Griffin, Merrill T  
**Received:** Apr,26,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** National Park Service Cape Hatteras National Seashore Cape Hatteras, NC  
Merrill T Griffin Larry T Griffin PO Box 552 Avon, NC 27915  
Dear Sirs,  
My husband and I totally disagree with the DEIS statement "prohibition of pets in the Seashore during bird breeding season including in front of the villages" (page 136). We feel this will affect very many visitors to our area. We do not have pets but feel people who do would definitely go elsewhere for vacation. Please continue to allow pets on leashes.  
Sincerely Merrill T Griffin 4/25/2010

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3885    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Griffin, Merrill T  
**Received:** Apr,26,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** National Park Service Cape Hatteras National Seashore Cape Hatteras, NC  
Merrill T Griffin Larry T Griffin PO Box 552 Avon, NC 27915  
Dear Sirs,  
My husband and I disagree with the statement in the DEIS "Visitor experience could be affected by conflicts between motorized and non-motorized recreation users" (p.vi). We have been coming to Avon, NC for 30 years and recently retired here permanently. We abide by all the closure signs and pick up plastic trash from the beach that is harmful to wildlife. Please continue to allow ORV access.  
Sincerely Merrill T Griffin 4/25/2010

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3886    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 10:24:08  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the efforts of the NPS to balance recreational use with the protection of the environment including endangered species at Cape Hatteras. We have been visiting the Outer Banks as a family for decades and we cherish the unique and diverse opportunities for outdoor recreation on the islands. Also, we have tremendously valued the refuge set aside within Pea Island. We appreciate the diversity of recreational opportunity it provides (as well as the refuge it provides to flora and fauna of course).  
For us, ORV access outside the refuge area is an important element of the heritage and culture on the outer banks and we have resented what we assess to be unfairly restrictive provisions since the consent decree was issued.  
I urge NPS to adopt policies which are the least restrictive to ORV access possible within the constraints of providing for public safety and of complying

0009867

with applicable law, including the Endangered Species Act. I urge NPS to take into consideration the area and miles of oceanfront already set aside in the Pea Island Refuge as you balance concerns and competing points of view.  
Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3887    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Keene, W James  
**Received:** Apr.26,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** Mike Murray, Superintendent Cape Hatteras National Seashore 1401 National Park Drive Manteo, NC 27954  
Oral comment, Ocracoke, NC (4-26-10)  
1. Alternative F: Management Based on Advisory Committee Input As a member of the Negotiated Rulemaking Advisory Committee I strongly object to the reference that Alternative F reflects in any important measures, the consensus or even the majority agreement of those who served on this committee (Ref. pages; 80, 467, 500, 592, 625, tables 7-13 & table ES-2). The NPS initially refused to record or broadcast our meetings and now inaccurately states that this document is a result of our actions. This reference is very similar to the biblical actions of Pontius Pilot who symbolically washed his hands after committing the most grievous act of all time. Of the 30 (27 voting + 3 governmental reps abstaining) committee members an overwhelming majority opposed the excessiveness of proposed buffer distances, nighttime closures, inconsistent village closures, pre-nesting closures, excessive permanent closures, etc. etc. While the committee could not reach consensus, it is untenable that NPS has totally ignored the input of an overwhelming majority in favor of preconceived regulations supported by a small minority group of 3-5 members.  
2.TCPs: The DEIS was prepared with indifference to the Traditional & Cultural values attached to surf zone access. This failure stands in direct violation of the NPS' legal responsibility under section 106 of NEPA and the NEPA frame work as a whole. This surf zone (as pictorially shown on the cover and pages 15, 18, 22, 259 & 260) had long had an unbroken history as both a location for traditional economic activities by also historical cultural activities that continue to present times. NPS has failed to do a proper study and has published a DEIS without completing the required studies that were requested by me, 15 months in advance of the DEIS publishing date. These studies must be completed and subjected to a section 106 review before the Final EIS is released.  
3.Excessive resource closures/buffers established for non-ESA listed species. These species (American Oyster Catchers, Black Skimmers, Common Terns, Least Terns & Wilson's Plover) are listed in the "Protected Wildlife Species of North Carolina" as "North Carolina Special Concern Species". The excessive closures as defined within the DEIS Species Management Strategies (pages 121-127, Table 10) in no way reflect the protection afforded these species by the state of North Carolina. The excessive closures granted these species by NPS has and will close more beach access than the closures afforded the ESA listed Piping Plover. We recommend that NPS not establish closures in excess of those defined/established by the state of North Carolina.  
W. James Keene PO Box 1615 Nags Head, NC 27959

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3888    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Gray, Gracie G  
**Received:** May.06,2010 10:24:24  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I own and operate a Campground in Avon NC. Other than my husband and I we hire two employees. Our total income depends on the tourist trade which has been cut severely due to beach closures. We have had the same people come every year since we opened. All most all of the repeats have found other places to spend their dollars. I ask that you consider we the people who live here when making final decisions on beach access. I think you know Hatteras has nothing to offer other than activities that revolve around our beaches and water ways. There has to be a place for both people and animals. The residents have been caring for our wildlife for as long as our ancestors have resided here.  
I am asking for my family and all other Hatteras and Ocracoke residents who depend on the tourist trade for our bread and butter to keep our beaches open while protecting our wildlife. As I write this my park is 95% empty where in the past we were 95% full. Speaking to those that are not here their reason is they are waiting for beach access issues to be resolved.  
I would also ask that you find a way to protect our Raccoons, Possum, fox and feral cats, while protecting th birds and turtles. All animals deserve to live in peace in the home they have had for hundreds of years.  
We all people and animals are depending on you to make the right decisions.  
Thank you for your time and consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3889    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.06,2010 10:25:41  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** (I apologize if this is a duplicate comment. When I clicked "submit" before, I received an error message and do not know if my comment went through so I'm resubmitting.)  
I appreciate the efforts of the NPS to balance recreational use with the protection of the environment including endangered species at Cape Hatteras. We have been visiting the Outer Banks as a family for decades and we cherish the unique and diverse opportunities for outdoor recreation on the islands. Also, we have tremendously valued the refuge set aside within Pea Island. We appreciate the diversity of recreational opportunity it provides (as well as the refuge it provides to flora and fauna of course).  
For us, ORV access outside the refuge area is an important element of the heritage and culture on the outer banks and we have resented what we assess to be unfairly restrictive provisions since the consent decree was issued.  
I urge NPS to adopt policies which are the least restrictive to ORV access possible within the constraints of providing for public safety and of complying with applicable law, including the Endangered Species Act. I urge NPS to take into consideration the area and miles of oceanfront already set aside in the Pea Island Refuge as you balance concerns and competing points of view.  
Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3890    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Berry, Dr Michael A  
**Received:** Apr.28,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** Dr Michael A. Berry 16 Charrington Place, Chapel Hill, NC 27517  
April 27, 2010 Mike Murray, Superintendent Cape Hatteras National Seashore 1401 National Park Drive Manteo, NC 27954 Comments on the Cape Hatteras National Seashore ORV Management Plan DEIS I wish to thank the National Park Service for an opportunity to comment on the Cape Hatteras National Seashore ORV Management Plan DEIS. As a concerned citizen, scientist, retired public administrator and university educator, I feel it is my professional and civic duty to make timely comment on a matter that affects thousands of citizens who wish to visit and have access to the Cape Hatteras National Seashore.  
For the record, I have a broad public service, technical, and scientific background. I have in,-depth knowledge of environmental sciences, research methods, and review procedures, especially those related to human health. I have basic knowledge of the federal environmental statutes and programs, and many years of firsthand experience with federal environmental policy-making processes. I hold the following degrees: Doctor of Philosophy in Public Health with a specialty in environmental management and protection from the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill; Master of Science in Management from Duke University's Fuqua School of Business; both Bachelor and Master of Science degrees in Mathematics from Gonzaga

University. I am a retired Lieutenant Colonel, Army Engineers and a combat veteran of the Viet Nam War. I have from time to time advised the Chief of Army Engineers and Under Secretary of Defense for Environment on a range of environmental issues, projects, and policies. In my civilian life, I retired from the US Environmental Protection Agency in 1998 after a 27-year career with that agency. For over 22 years, I served as the Deputy Director of the National Center for Environmental Assessment at Research Triangle Park, NC. During my EPA career I had extensive interactions with foreign, state, and local governments; federal environmental agencies and offices; the federal courts; US Congress; universities world-wide; institutions to include the National Academy of Sciences, the World Health Organization, and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization; the major environmental organizations; private industry and trade associations. For more than 20 years, I was either an adjunct or full-time faculty member at the University of North Carolina where I taught environmental science and management courses in the Department of Environmental Sciences and Engineering, the Kenan, Flagler Business School, and Environmental Studies Program.

I wish to state clearly for the public record that I have been for the past four decades and remain today and forever in the future, professionally committed to protection of the environment. I am primarily concerned with environmental conditions that affect the health and well-being of humans and with the conservation of natural resources that are essential components of a healthy environment. Given the ever changing environmental conditions brought about by growing human populations and expanding regional and global economies, effective environmental management is more essential now than ever before, but never at the expense of violating human and Constitutional rights of citizens.

I reside at 16 Charrington Place, Chapel Hill, North Carolina, 27517. I can be contacted with regard to these comments at drmikeberry@gmail.com.

Comment 1 There is a clear need for an equitable, balanced, and effective seashore access policy and management plan. Growing national population, seashore visitation, transportation avenues into the Outer Banks region mandates an access management policy-but one which has widespread public support and one that balances the rights and traditions of public use and access to the national seashore with responsible but reasonable resource protection.

As currently structured, Alternative F is not primarily an ORV management plan. It is primarily a public access restriction plan. The plan is biased toward bird and turtle protection, seashore isolation and not to a reasonable extent on public use and visitor access-specifically ORV and pedestrian access.

Responsible environmental management uses sound science and unbiased professional judgment that balances the human needs and rights of people with the needs to manage and sustain natural processes. The preferred proposal, Alternative F, fails to meet these criteria. Alternative F fails to recognize objective science, enabling legislation, citizen rights, historical uses, and past promises of access to their environment.

Promulgation of Alternative F as it is currently structured will be the basis for widespread public dissatisfaction, continued distrust of government, especially the National Park Service, and costly litigation.

Comment 2 As indicated by Alternative F, it is the intention of National Park Service (NPS) to transform a major part of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area-set aside over 70 years ago for use and enjoyment of American citizens-into a wildlife sanctuary, predominantly a national bird and turtle use area. NPS is using as its justification for this radical transformation and departure from traditional and intended public use, a thirty-five year old executive order directing NPS to formally promulgate an ORV management plan.

Alternative F management plan, with its excessive restrictions and denial of public access, both pedestrian and ORV, is in large part incompatible with the legislative purpose and intent of why the national seashore was established (16USC459 CHNSRA Enabling Legislation):

"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."

Nowhere is it indicated in the DEIS where enabling legislation intends or permits both pedestrian and vehicular access denial for a major part of the year, particularly visitor or vacation season.

Comment 3 NPS Request for public comment appears to be more of a bureaucratic process than a search for substantive decision-making information. By virtue of its massive size, complexity, biased and incomplete explanation of science, and the inability for members of the public to access cited scientific literature and references, and ask questions of government officials responsible for the science and DEIS content, no single citizen can effectively review, understand, and constructively comment or suggest improvement to the DEIS in the 60 day comment period.

It appears by way of emphasis in the discussion in the DEIS that NPS has every intention to promulgate Alternative F in the next year, regardless of past or present public comment. There is virtually no significant reference to the workbooks the public provided in the early stages of the plan development process or to countless constructive comments made by the public during the 15 month Regulation Negotiation Process.

The National Park Service (NPS) should make it known to the public the specific information it seeks so as to make a final, objective decision with regard to an ORV management plan for Cape Hatteras National Sea Shore Recreational Area. Thus far NPS has failed to do so. By not asking for specific information, NPS is simply "going through the motions" superficially, and wasting the public's time.

Comment 4 NPS presents Alternative F as if it were recommended by the recent Regulatory Negotiation process. However, upon close examination Alternative F is found to be a biased and highly restrictive management plan that is in complete opposition to majority recommendations of the recent Regulation Negotiation process. Alternative F strengthens and codifies the denial of public access provisions of the current consent decree. The public access denying provisions of the consent decree, put into effect April 30, 2008, have been extended and transferred to Alternative F. The majority of Regulatory Negotiation Committee stakeholders (19 vs. 5) and numerous public commentators did not recommend an extension of the restrictive provisions of the consent decree as part of a final ORV plan.

Comment 5 If promulgated, Alternative F will significantly change the economy and unique culture of the Outer Banks. The DEIS has failed to properly assess those changes. The Economic Impact Analysis found the DEIS by its own admission is incomplete. This alone is the basis for future litigation challenging the legality of the proposed plan. In addition the Economic analysis is structured in such a manner that it fails to address full costs-direct costs, indirect costs, lost opportunity costs, costs of future liability, and hidden costs. The Economic Analysis fails to recognize that the national seashore environment is a unique form of capital that serves the local economy, and in turn the health and wellbeing of citizens and families that depend of that economy. Access to the seashore is essential for family business operations on the Outer Banks.

The cost to society and the local communities under the restrictive consent decree has now been extended indefinitely into Alternative F. Economic losses in millions of dollars have occurred to island businesses especially motels, campgrounds, restaurants and tackle shops. The full costs of Alternative F are very much understated in the DEIS. Annual economic losses under the consent decree are already in excess of those estimated by Research Triangle Institute.

Comment 6 The DE IS has failed to inform the public of the extent of expected closures to the most popular recreational sites of the national seashore. Experience with the consent decree closures for the past two years (2008, 2009) provide a clear indication of the extent to which the national seashore will be closed to public access-ORV and pedestrian. In recent court testimony the National Seashore Superintendent indicated the extent of the closures, but nowhere does that data appear in the DEIS. The public should know what to expect when Alternative F is promulgated.

The Bodie Island Spit was closed a total of 136 days in 2009. Cape Point was closed 101 days in 2009. The Hatteras Island Spit was closed 125 days and south Ocracoke was closed 80 days. These are some of the most popular recreational use areas at the national seashore which will not be accessible to the public during late spring and summer months.

Comment 7 Nowhere in the DEIS is it indicated that should listed species populations grow in size through natural population cycles or management programs, the public loses even more access given the way the boundary distance are applied.

Comment 8 Nowhere in the DEIS is it mentioned that protected species populations are growing without the needs of additional restrictions such as those of consent decree and Alternative F.

Published USFWS data suggests that the piping plover is "recovering" well beyond 1986 levels and do not suggest that additional restrictions beyond regional recovery plans are necessary or essential at the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area for the continued recovery of the species.

Piping Plover-Atlantic Coast Pairs

Table insert: showing numbers of nesting pairs of Piping Plovers per year. (790 in 1986; 1386 in 1999; 1632 in 2005; 1749 in 2006; and 1880 in 2007) <http://www.fws.gov/northeast/pipingplover/index.html>

Comment 9 Data collected and published by NPS in recent suggest that Cape Hatteras National Seashore Interim Management Plan prepared with public input and publically reviewed in 2005, published in the Federal Register was showing every sign of being effective at protecting birds and natural resources. The Interim Management Plan was set aside by the court and replaced by the consent decree and settlement that mandated extensive closures without public comment or review.

The consent decree closures of recent years have been of exorbitantly high cost to the public but have not contributed to an improvement in species production or safety. The consent decree has produced no natural resource benefit over and above the interim plan. The fledge counts were higher under the interim plan than under the consent decree. 7 Piping Plovers fledged in 2008 under the interim plan, 6 in 2009 under the highly restrictive consent decree. 17 American Oyster Catchers (AMOY) fledged in 2008 under the interim plan and 13 in 2009 under the highly access restrictive consent decree, the same management structure now found in Alternative F. Species productivity is decreasing under consent decree and now Alternative F restrictions. Comment 10 The majority of nests and hatched birds the past two closure seasons under the consent decree were lost to predation, a few to storms, one at the hands of a university researcher trying to band a bird. None has been lost to ORVs or pedestrians accessing the national seashore. The huge closure distances in the consent decree and Alternative F restrictions keep pedestrians and ORVs off the seashore while birds are nesting. At the same time, the extensive closures also provide for the proliferation and increased free movement of predators. In effect, the extensive closures create an ecological trap for birds in large closures that encourage and enhance predation.

Comment 11 When the boundary distances shown on Table 11 are applied to the Alternative F framework, it is evident that the public, ORV and pedestrian, lose access to a vast amount of the seashore for most of the visitor season. Closure boundaries are overly restrictive at CHNSRA and are not used at other NPS properties. There has been no administrative or science based explanation given to the public for these especially restrictive closures that limit public access to the seashore.

NPS has failed to explain specifically why, by way of science justification, 1000 meter boundaries must be established every time a Plover chick is observed, where the literature indicates on average movement under 200 meters. There is no study or science based explanation that justifies an automatic 1000 meter boundary closure every time a plover chick is observed. In fact the public access denial consequences of such management policy for a national seashore set aside for public use is excessive and does not indicate a balance of responsible usage.

If, as the Alternative F regulation dictates, one extends a boundary out 1000m in every direction from a nest, one creates a circle with a boundary circumference of approximately 3.9 miles, and an area of approximately 1.2 square miles or approximately 775 acres. Given that the boundary regulation dictates 775 acres of national seashore be set aside for the exclusive use of a plover chick-during the height of vacation and visitor season, it obviously does not take too many widely distributed plover chicks to shut down a significant portion of Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area especially if the Plover population increases.

Comment 12 Alternative F, as with the consent decree, establishes a policy of denial of access punishment for the general public when intrusions into closure areas occur. Every time there is a closure intrusion the National Park Service, now at its own discretion, extends restrictive boundaries and widens non-access areas. There is no basis in science or environmental management practices that justifies such punitive measures.

Comment 13 Many of the references used to justify Alternative F are those of individuals and activists organizations who have supported litigation that denies public access. The major science references are published by environmental activist organizations and authored by individuals trying to shut down ORV access to the national seashore: Audubon, Blue Water, Hatteras Island Bird Club, etc. Most of these references have not been reviewed for their accuracy or objectivity and are unsuitable for government decision-making. Many of the references are out dated, biased, contain incomplete and misleading information, and few have ever been reviewed in open forum.

Comment 14 NPS has failed to provide the public with essential items of information, specifically properly reviewed science. The main science references are unsuitable and inappropriate as the basis for a government regulation that restricts public access to the national seashore and has significant negative impacts on the Outer Banks economy.

The 2005 USGS Protocols are indicated by NPS as the primary basis for the highly restrictive boundary distances that restrict public access to the national seashore. The USGS Protocols are cited as being "in press" 5 years after they first appeared on the Park Service website. The 2005 USGS Protocols were challenged two years ago as being in non compliance with USGS Peer Review Policy. At that time the documents were not dated, had no government publication number, and were not published in the open literature or Federal Register and were clearly unsuitable to be a credible scientific basis for government decision-making, especially costly regulation. The documents were sent back to USGS for "review" in 2009, five years after they were first made known to the public.

NPS has indicated a new citation for the USGS Protocols. They are currently referenced on page 660 as: Cohen, J.B., R.M. Erwin, I.B. French Jr., J.L. Marion, and J.M. Meyers In press, Recommendations for Management of Endangered Species at Cape Hatteras National Seashore. U.S. Geological Survey Open-File Report 2009-1262.

NPS uses the USGS protocol recommendations as if they are "best available science." They are not science and have not been shown to be connected with specific scientific studies. The management options presented in the protocols are the policy and management recommendations and opinions of biased and non-reviewed contributors, deemed by USGS to be the "experts." Nowhere is a specific science basis (study, data) for a given management option-established solely for the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area--demonstrated.

In a slightly modified introduction to the most recent release of the Protocols, the government official responsible for the document states: "Although no new original research or experimental work was conducted, this synthesis of the existing information was peer reviewed by over 15 experts with familiarity with these species. This report does not establish NPS management protocols but does highlight scientific information on the biology of these species to be considered by NPS managers who make resource management decisions at CAHA."

The new publication was not accessible, peer reviewed, or fully explained by government authority at the time the DEIS was submitted to the public for comment in early March 2010.

The literature reviews found in the USGS Protocols as currently published are significantly out of date. In fact many studies were decades out of date at the time the document was prepared in 2005. They are mainly non-replicated, selective papers and studies. Many citations are over 20 years old and most are not related to the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area. The public does not have access to the literature reviewed in this essential report and most of the citations are so insignificant they cannot even be found in a major university library (UNC-CH).

Comment 15 There is an "appearance of impropriety" and "conflict of interest" associated with the primary science basis justification for the Alternative F recommendation.

As noted two years ago, the cited protocols are not reviewed consistent with published USGS peer review policy guidelines (<http://www.usgs.gov/usgs-manual/500/502-3.html>) especially with regard to full disclosures and conflicts of interests. In fact the Protocols were developed and prepared in large part by well known environmental activists who subsequently used them as the basis for law suit against NPS, thus creating a very clear conflict of interest in full view of the federal government.

A review of the public record indicates that USGS commissioned well known environmental activist scientists to selectively review and discuss the science as they choose to represent it, and then formulate and recommend management options and policies. There was no outside questioning and review of their work-paid for by federal tax dollars.

It is clear to those of us who understand the scientific methods and process, objective scientific review, and the internal workings of federal government, that the 2004-2005 cooperative agreement review of the science (undertaken in part by members of the Audubon Society and other activist organizations) is biased and selective, misrepresented, fraught with speculation and opinion, and in many cases based on information that has nothing whatsoever to do with Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

In 2005 the architects of the access denying protocols were acknowledged for their contributions. For nearly three years now we have asked NPS and USGS to identify the "independent outside reviewers" of the USGS Protocols consistent with USGS Peer Review Policy. We are now being informed by USGS through their press office that the "science peer reviewers" are the original contributors and architects of the Protocols (which are not science at all, but policy and management opinions/recommendations that regulate the public and deny public access to the national seashore). We are also being informed by press officials that it is the policy of USGS to not identify outside independent peer reviewers or their comments. This is a violation of the Freedom of Information Act and the Federal Advisory Committee Act.

Some of the original contributors (Cohen and Golder) have used the Protocols to be the basis for litigation and insist on denial of public access to the seashore. A lead author "J.B. Cohen" has previously shown his conflict of interest and activist affiliation when he "J.B. Cohen" signed a sworn affidavit in support of the Consent Decree for SELC (2008) and also signed the recent Audubon letter directed at NPS Officials recommending the highest level of access restriction (2009). Scientists working on behalf of the public cannot turn around and use that same work to sue to public without having the objectivity of their work called into question.

For over 15 months of Regulation Negotiation Process, Golder, other environmental activist members, and the federal government never disclosed participants' roles in the design of the Protocols, but constantly referred to them as being the definitive "best available science" justification for closures.

0009870

Golder and others now appear as "peer reviewers" of their own work. This is discrediting in and of itself, but what is most disturbing and unethical about this is the fact that this highly biased, pseudo science process, sponsored by the federal government, has denied thousands of citizens access to their national seashore and will continue to do so unless it corrected by NPS, the federal courts, or the congress.

The above is clearly a "apparent conflict of interest" known to NPS and USGS officials and calls into question the credibility of science which in the public policy making process--specifically that of denying public access to the national seashore--must be "objective" beyond any doubt. Local media have noted this "apparent conflict of interest" and brought it to the attention of NPS and USGS officials who refuse to offer an explanation or response. The best course of action to resolve this matter is to turn the science review and update over the National Academy of Sciences or some other neutral party, to objectively, critically, and comprehensively review all relevant science, disclose the facts and restore some public trust in the scientific process used as the basis for environmental management decisions at Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Respectfully Submitted Michael A. Berry

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3891    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Allen, Glen B  
**Received:** Apr,28,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** I strongly support and agree with the Coalition for Beach Access\* Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area ORV Access Environmental Impact Position Statement dated March 5, 2010.  
\*American Sportfishing Association \*Avon Property Owners Association \*Cape Hatteras Anglers Club \*North Carolina Beach Buggy Association  
\*Outer Banks Preservation Association \*United Mobile Sportsfishermen \*Watersports Industry Association, Inc. \*Outer Banks Chamber of Commerce (April 6, 2010)

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3892    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** unknown, unknown  
**Received:** Apr,28,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** I would like to address you, today, as a property owner on Hatteras Island. I purchased my house 7 years ago with a view to retirement after many years of purchasing weekly rentals because my family and I love the Outer Banks. I rented this property to vacationers until last September ? a few months after I retired. I must tell you that I saw no difference in my rental volume because of stricter beach driving regulations.  
What I have seen is that the vast majority of vacationers at the Outer Banks are families who have come for the simple pleasures of the National Sea Shore. They have come to enjoy the waves, walk along the beach, enjoy the scenery and the wild life, and play in the sand ? as do my family and I. I have seen a marked increase of sea turtles, and shore birds during the period of stricter beach driving regulations. My family and I have enjoyed volunteering to help watch over sea turtle nests, and have helped to rescue distressed sea turtles.  
I have come to plead with you to preserve the National Sea Shore as a natural sea shore; a place where I am glad to spend much of my retirement and a place whose natural wonders attracts so many tourists and has become a would destination. Therefore I endorse Alternative D, as recommended by the National Park Service, for the protection of this wonderful yet fragile environment.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3893    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 10:28:46  
**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:** 3894    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** DeSota, Patrick  
**Received:** Apr,28,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** Patrick DeSota 5448 Mack Lineberry Rd. Climax, NC  
Mike Murray, Superintendent Cape Hatteras National Seashore 1401 National Park Drive Manteo, NC 27954  
Dear Mr. Murray  
My name is Patrick DeSota from Climax North Carolina and I am 18 years old. I am writing to you today to express my opinion on the NPS plan for Ocracoke and the Cape Hatteras National Seashore. When I was 14 years old, My dad and I, and a few friends drove out on the beach at 7:30 PM to go fishing for the night on Ocracoke. Never been surf fishing in my life, and that one night, I caught a 50= red drum. It was the best night of my life! But with what the NPS is doing with the "no driving rule" and "limited times to drive", I honestly don't want to go back to the outer banks. It's just that plain and simple. The economy will be crushed from Ocracoke and the island will slowly disappear off the face of the earth. All the fisherman and women that go to the outer banks that live in the central part of NC are appalled with this! No one likes this idea at all. For once listen to the citizens and not just the people that make a high salaries and think they know everything.  
People should be able to fish when and where ever they want and not have to worry about no driving times or birds. Birds have migrated for the last 1.5 million years and to me, it doesn't seem like they've had a problem yet.  
Don't restrict our time to a certain limit and not allow us to fish where we want to fish because of tiny birds that migrate all the time. There are other options to this. People could be assigned passes and be able to fish wherever they want and not have to worry, but the people that don't have passes

can't.

Without us citizens, the Outer Banks wouldn't be where it is today. But if these outrageous plans get put into place (like limiting our hours of driving and even driving at all), you can count me out of ever going there again. Along with a bunch of other's here in the Piedmont of NC.

Sincerely, Patrick O. DeSota

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3895    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Dutton, Max  
**Received:** Apr,27,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** Comments on the DEIS Changes Needed in Alternative F By Max Dutton My name is Max Dutton. In looking at the Draft Environmental Impact Statement that will govern the future of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area, it is important that we first look back and learn from the past, before we charge ahead and repeat critical errors. There are lessons to be learned from the past that can help guide the National Park Service now in making modifications that are desperately needed in preferred alternative F. First and foremost, we must acknowledge a fundamental principle that the health and welfare of humans comes first. We are the ones divinely entrusted with the responsibility to do the right thing, and live in harmony with nature. It is a fact, that for generations the residents and visitors of the Outer Banks have been outstanding stewards of wildlife. When the special interest groups filed their lawsuit against the Park Service, they were trying to fix something that wasn't broken. Their mistake in judgment led to a consent decree that has caused enormous harm to our community. And, what they refuse to admit is that the consent decree not only hurt people, but the threatened species did better under the previous Interim Plan. Unfortunately that plan has been written off by the National Park Service in the DEIS as a "No-Action" alternative. One of the principles of the Interim Plan was that the Park Superintendent should have the "flexibility" to manage buffers and resources based upon actual conditions in the field?..rather than the extremist demands of special interest groups. Please ? modify Alternative F to give "flexibility" for Corridors, especially in the restrictive Management Level 1 areas. Please ? modify Alternative F to give "flexibility" to the Park Superintendent to establish practical buffers based on transparent, peer reviewed science. Remember, the consent decree was prepared behind closed doors by the special interest groups. They're the ones who established the 1,000 meter buffer, with no scientific justification. Please, take those 1,000 meter buffers out of the alternative F, before it is too late. Please ? Do not make the same mistake twice. Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3896    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Hardham, Larry  
**Received:** Apr,27,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** NIGHT DRIVING  
Page XX of the DEIS alternative F: Nov 16 to Apr 30: Designated ORV routes would be open to ORV use 24 hours a day. May 1 to Nov 15: Designated ORV routes in potential sea turtle nesting habitat (ocean intertidal zone, ocean backshore, and dunes) would be closed to nonessential ORV use from 1 hour after sunset until turtle patrol has checked the beach in the morning (by approx. one-half hour after sunrise). Sep 16 to Nov 15: ORV routes with no or low density of turtle nests remaining would reopen for night driving, subject to terms and conditions of an ORV permit. Hours of night-driving prohibition would be established in the Superintendent's Compendium and subject to periodic review.  
Last night David Scarborough commented that there is no need for night driving restrictions as it does not meet the requirements of "major adverse" impacts as defined on page 369 of the DEIS. All you need to do is look at the history here as recorded in the annual sea turtle reports and you will find the following:  
2000-2003 with night driving and wood 2x2 wood stakes at closures the false crawl to nest ratio was 0.75:1  
2004-2005 with white carsonite stakes at closures the false crawl to nest ratio jumped to 1.62:1. Neither NPS, USF&W nor NCWRC flinched at this dramatic increase. Only after I showed this problem to you Mike was a change made.  
2006-2007 you started using brown carsonite stakes at closures while night driving was still allowed and the false crawl to nest ratio dropped to 0.98:1 without the unexplained 24 false crawls a the hook bird closure at Cape Point.  
2008-2009 with brown carsonite stakes and no night driving the false crawl to nest ratio was 0.95:1  
Thus the lowest false crawl to nest ratio in the last ten years has been with night driving and the wood stakes.  
It is clear that at the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area false crawls have been increased by the use of carsonite stakes and not reduced by a ban on night driving. I repeat not reduced by a night driving ban.  
It is also worth noting that the false crawl ratio in front of villages on Hatteras Island in the last ten years has been 0.67:1.  
USF&W expected false crawl to nest ratio on an undeveloped beach is 1:1. Please use science from here at Cape Hatteras and not from Florida!  
Submitted by: Larry Hardham, P O Box 1268, Buxton, NC 27920  
Sea Turtle nest loss at CHNSRA  
Pages 219 and 220 of the DEIS state:  
Natural Catastrophes. Periodic, short-term, weather-related erosion events (e.g., atmospheric fronts, Nor'easter storms, tropical storms, and hurricanes) are common phenomena throughout the loggerhead nesting range and may vary considerably from year to year. It was reported that 24.5% of all loggerhead nests laid on Deerfield Beach, Florida, in 1992 were lost or destroyed by Hurricane Andrew as a result of storm surge (NMFS and USFWS 2008). Similarly, Martin (1996) reported a 22.7% loss of total loggerhead nest production on the southern portion of Hutchinson Island, Florida, during the passage of Hurricane Erin in 1995. Ehrhart and Witherington (1987) reported a 19% loss of loggerhead nests at Melbourne Beach, Florida, after a 5-day Nor'easter storm in 1985. In Georgia, 16% of loggerhead nests were lost to tropical storm systems in 2001; nest loss was particularly high on Sapelo (54%) and Little Cumberland islands (28%). On Fisher Island in Florida, it was reported that hatchling emerging success decreased significantly following Hurricane Andrew in 1992 (NMFS and USFWS 2008). They found that hatchlings were unable to emerge from nests where sand had accreted in large quantities and that these hatchlings probably died from asphyxiation or exhaustion while struggling to emerge from the nests. Sea turtles have evolved a strategy to offset these natural events by laying large numbers of eggs and by distributing their nests both spatially and temporally.  
The six percentages listed under "Natural Catastrophes" that I just read average 27.3% and these same events are listed in the revised 2009 Loggerhead Recovery Plan under the same heading on page 44. In fact the DEIS paragraph is virtual quote from the Recovery Plan.  
Page 220 of the DEIS state: Threat Occurrences at Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The following data and discussions are from the Seashore's annual sea turtle reports, 1999 to 2008, and include all turtle species (NPS 2000b, 2001c, 2002c, 2003e, 2005c, 2006e, 2008a, 2009c; Sayles pers. comm. 2005). The majority of turtle nest losses at the Seashore from 1999 to 2007 were weather related, particularly due to hurricanes and other storms. During this time, six hurricanes caused impacts to nests. In 2003, Hurricane Isabel destroyed 52 of the 87 nests (34 had hatched before the storm); there was so much water and sand movement along the beaches that no evidence of any nests could be found afterward. The Seashore also felt the effects of numerous tropical storms and hurricanes as they passed by offshore.  
I find it interesting that the Recovery Plan does not even mention the 52 of the 87 nests lost in 2003 at Cape Hatteras which amounted to a 59.8% loss which would be higher than any other catastrophic event listed.  
Another interesting fact about Cape Hatteras, not listed in the DEIS, is that between 2000 and 2009 (ten years) this Seashore has the outstanding records of losing 36.4% of nests laid in the Seashore. In the Recovery Plan USF&W seems to think that the state of Georgia having lost a full 16% of nest laid there in 2001 was catastrophic. What would they call a ten year average of 36.4%? In fact last year with no hurricanes or tropical storms within 400 miles we lost 36.58% of nests laid here.  
The most amazing thing is that the DEIS turtle program continues to support the exact same policies that produced these catastrophic losses of the last ten years. How do you justify your support of a program which results in a loss of 36.4% of nest each year? What do you call a plan that produces 33.3% more lost nests than catastrophic losses? The only thing that comes to mind is GUILTY OF A TAKE. Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area probably has the largest sea turtle closures and the least productive nesting of any beach in the Loggerhead nesting habitat.  
A written sea turtle plan will be submitted as a comment to the DEIS with features used in other areas acting under the same Loggerhead Recovery Plan with approval by USF&W service and state agencies that will address the shortcomings of the DEIS while affording added protection and at the same

**Correspondence ID:** 3897    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Harris, Jim  
**Received:** Apr,27,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** DEIS COMMENT 4 25 10 Global warming & sea level rise  
 DEIS page 293;  
 Impacts of Climate Change  
 Studies predict that coastal barrier islands and their natural and cultural resources will be affected by sea level rise and potentially stronger storm events resulting from climate change. Relative sea level is currently rising in northeastern North Carolina at a rate of 16 to 18 inches per century, a substantially higher rate than the 7 inches per century one hundred years ago and the 3 inches per century rate 200 years ago Stan Riggs & others; <http://www.google.com/search?hl=en&q=stan+riggs+ecu+%2B+sea+level+rise&start=10&sa=N> Page 62  
 IPCC (2001) PREDICTED MAXIMUM RATE OF GLOBAL SEA-LEVEL RISE = 0.88 M (2.89 FT) 2100  
 IPCC (2001) PREDICTED MEAN RATE OF GLOBAL SEA-LEVEL RISE = 0.49 M (1.61 FT) 2100  
 PRESENT RATE OF SEA-LEVEL RISE IN NORTH CAROLINA = 0.31 M (1.0 FT) PER CENTURY  
 -chart insert: showing sea-level changes through the Late Pleistocene, Holocene, present and future.  
 The above chart is wrong. IPCC (2001) prediction has not happened in CHNSRA. The present rate (solid line) has not happened. It cannot be demonstrated anywhere. If this prediction were true it would be evident on bridge pilings, dock pilings, breakwaters, seawalls, and most importantly all the beaches.  
 Erosion is not sea level rise.  
 Reduced beach width is not sea level rise.  
 Tidal & wind driven flooding is not sea level rise.  
 Subsidence is not sea level rise.  
 The major players in global warming/sea level rise have been caught manipulating their own and others documents to fit an agenda consisting of a "get rich scheme". Everything from the U. N., IPCC, East Anglia University, Dr. Mann (hockey stick) and many others have ruined any chance of honesty doing good scientific work.  
 Jim Harris 92 S. Dogwood Tr. Southern Shores NC 27949

**Correspondence ID:** 3898    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Hodgeflex?, Alex  
**Received:** Apr,28,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** April 28, 2010  
 Mike Murray, Superintendent Cape Hatteras National Seashore 1401 National Park Drive Manteo, NC 27954  
 Re: comment on Draft ORV Management Plan (DEIS)  
 Dear Superintendent Murray:  
 I strongly support and agree with the Coalition for Beach Access\* Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area ORV Access Environmental Impact Position Statement dated March 5, 2010.  
 \*American Sportfishing Association \*Avon Property Owners Association \*Cape Hatteras Anglers Club \*North Carolina Beach Buggy Association  
 \*Outer Banks Preservation Association \*United Mobile Sportsfishermen \*Watersports Industry Association, Inc. \*Outer Banks Chamber of Commerce (April 6, 2010)  
 Respectfully,  
 Alex Hodgeflex (?) 100 Tobacco Road Henderson, N.C. 27537

**Correspondence ID:** 3899    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Johnson, Mike  
**Received:** Apr,27,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** Comments on the DEIS Protection for Non-Endangered Birds By Mike Johnson  
 My name is Mike Johnson. I would like to speak tonight about the unwarranted protection that the Draft Environmental Impact Statement gives to non-endangered birds. The DEIS, as it is now written, in pages 121 to 127, requires huge closures for birds that are not endangered, and not even threatened. These include gigantic 300 meter buffers for American Oystercatchers, Least Terns and colonial Waterbirds --- again species that are NOT endangered. These non-endangered birds are protected in the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area only because they appear on the North Carolina list of species of concern. The purpose of this North Carolina listing is only to designate certain birds for future monitoring and tracking on a statewide level. The purpose was never to force federal agencies, such as the National Park Service, to adopt this state list and impose restrictions, as if these birds were endangered. The North Carolina "List of Concern" should not be used against us in the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area. This is a major issue for our residents and visitors because it was these non-endangered birds that closed down Oregon Inlet, Cape Point, and other areas from March through late August of last year. Instead, we recommend a more reasonable, and yet effective 30 meter buffer for non-endangered birds. And, these non-listed birds should not be given pre-nesting closures. Also, on the subject of non-threatened and non-endangered birds, I have a concern that all birds in the same ecosystem should be counted. This is the only way to accurately determine the real numbers of birds in an area. For example, in determining the number of birds in the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area, it is crucial to consider the many birds that are thriving on nearby dredge and spoil islands, such as Cora June Island. While only 500 yards away from the shores of Hatteras Village, Cora June Island is home to many birds where they enjoy a habitat free of predators. However, the Park Service does not include the birds on these islands, even though they really are part of the same ecosystem as the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area. I believe the DEIS should be changed now before it becomes written in stone. Do not give the maximum level of protection to non-endangered and non-threatened species. And, count the birds that are just a stones-throw away from the seashore. Thank you. Mike Johnson Dare Co. Commissioner  
 I also agree with the comments of John Newbold, Gary Gross, Max Dutton, Allen Burrus, Bobby Cuttan, Larry Hardham, Warren Judge.

**Correspondence ID:** 3900    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Joyner, David K  
**Received:** Apr,28,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** Hello, my name is David Joyner and I am Vice-President of the North Carolina Beach Buggy Association. I have been coming to Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area with my family since 1960. After years of standing on concrete, going up and down chimneys my knees are weak & I can no longer walk great distances. Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area belongs to all citizens of this United States of America. It is not just for the young and fit, but for everyone including those with limited mobility. For every mile of beach set aside for Permanent Resource Closures and Pedestrian Only Areas you are denying access to hundreds of people with disabilities, not just folks like me but the young men and women who are fighting our wars and coming home with missing limbs. Those with disabilities cannot make it thru the soft sand between parking lots and the ocean. Families with small children cannot carry everything a family needs for a day at the beach on their backs. Include vehicle corridors thru seasonal

resource closures to allow access to open areas that would otherwise be inaccessible because everyone could not walk to them. We need our vehicles to access areas for recreation & the vehicle needs to stay with us on the beach in the event of a medical emergency or sudden storm. A Special Use Permit to allow a Handicapped Person to be transported to the beach & then the vehicle having to be moved is unacceptable! When you write this Final Driving Plan for the Park, please remember it is about access, not denial to a treasure known as Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area. Please do not keep me and others from having the joy of being by the ocean.

Thank You,

David K. Joyner 33518 Joyners Bridge Road Franklin, VA 23851

**Correspondence ID:** 3901    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Latham, Judith C

**Received:** Apr,28,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** I'm Judy Latham, ordinary private citizen, a widow of modest means and I live here in Wake County. My one-acre organic garden is Backyard Wildlife Habitat #27392. I maintain five bird feeders, two fountains and a bird bath. I am also a very poor but enthusiastic surf fisherwoman. I'm not strong enough to cast very far, but that doesn't mean I don't enjoy trying just as much as anyone else. I've loved the Outer Banks since my first visit in 1970. My husband proposed to me in the shadow of the Ocracoke lighthouse and we watched the first sunrise of the new millennium from the beach in Buxton. When he died suddenly, it was there I fled to for my first Christmas without him. I can't afford to buy an oceanfront cottage. I can't even afford to rent one without sharing. But I can afford to own a 4wd vehicle which has transported me and my bad foot out to paradise from time to time. My fear with any of the DEIS alternatives is that those opportunities will diminish or disappear entirely. I cannot support any one of the six. It is my belief the buffers even in alternative F are excessive and have no scientific basis. The economic data is vague and geographically irrelevant. Also, in my opinion, TCP consideration has gotten short shrift. The scenario I see playing out is that extensive closures will pressure some service businesses to fail so that when the beaches do occasionally open for visitors, the remaining services will be inadequate and/or priced for the wealthy only. And that leaves me out. During the current global financial crises, American citizens need national parks for low-cost recreation more than ever. I am bitterly disappointed that my government has defended itself and me so passively. The only upside, I suppose some would say, is that there's full employment amount environmental lawyers. I submit that I am the truly threatened species at Cape Hatteras, not the plovers. I strongly urge a compromise plan with the Pro-access Coalition Position Statement. I'll make additional specific comments electronically.

Thank you.

Judith C. Latham 7905 Tulip Circle Raleigh, NC 27606 JCLathamNC@aol.com (919)760-7562

**Correspondence ID:** 3902    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Lea, James W

**Received:** Apr,28,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** Comments on the DEIS/ORV Management Plan Care Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area

James W. Lea Buxton NC Homeowner Professor of Family Medicine UNC ? Chapel Hill School of Medicine April 28, 2010

Mr. Superintendent, I find the DEIS/ORV management plan to be fatally weak, especially with regard to its handling of bird and turtle ecology, its description of the risks to wildlife posed by ORVs, pedestrians and pets on the Seashore beaches, its cavalier dismissal of habitat management strategies for preserving both recreation and conservation, and its shortsighted treatment of the economic consequences of the Action Alternatives for the residents of the Outer Banks and of the entire state of North Carolina. To be specific: On pages 281 and 284, the DEIS acknowledges that "beach-related tourism drives the economy of the area." And that's it. None of the Action Alternatives specifically provides for protecting that vital element of resident life, acknowledging only that businesses on the islands "may" be damaged when beach closures force recreational visitors to vacation, fish, surf, bird watch and spend their dollars elsewhere. Nor does the analysis address the economic damage to the rest of North Carolina from the loss of revenues generated by the state's third-ranked producer of tourism-related taxes. As tourism is dramatically diminished on Bodie, Hatteras and Ocracoke Islands by visitors' loss of beach access ? as it will be if the DEIS goes forward as written ? the state's budgets for education, roads, social services and other mandates will go back to the chopping block or everyone's taxes will go up. All North Carolinians would then be able to say to their Outer Banks neighbors: "Now I really feel your pain." In addition, the documentation that justifies restricting public access to the Seashore's public beaches reminds me of the "best available science" that for thousands of years kept our ancestors believing that the earth was flat. What's presented as scientific reporting throughout the DEIS is often scattered observations seasoned with the observers' preferences ? instead of peer-replicated independent experimental studies that real science is made of. Page 208 describes weather and tides as a significant risk factor for piping plovers on the beach. "A strong thunderstorm was noted on the night before Nest 2 on South Beach was discovered lost; however, the loss is characterized as 'unknown' because it cannot be shown conclusively that weather was the cause." But on page 209, we read "The impact of predation had been postulated to be greater on beaches with high human use because of the presence of pets and trash." The relationship between humans and predators is not characterized as "unknown because it cannot be shown conclusively." Whatever happened to burden of proof? This is the kind of biased writing that slants much of the document and it's not acceptable. It's a universally accepted premise of science, business and most other organized, goal-oriented endeavors that if you can't measure it, you can't manage it. The DEIS I'm reading today is woefully short on credible measurement and should not be a basis for any attempt at ORV and beach use management. Thank you.

**Correspondence ID:** 3903    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I have enjoyed many trips to the Outer Banks with my kite and have left nothing but foot prints. It has been brought to the attention of the kiteboarding community that a variety of plans are being considered in response to proposed environmental and ecological concerns. The Outer Banks of North Carolina is a sanctuary for many beach goers, sports enthusiasts, wildlife observers and most importantly, the natural environment. We, as a community, feel that it is important for the environment to be protected and thus understand certain steps may be 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 away 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 wildlife. We strongly feel that the Historical, Cultural, and Economic ramifications of the proposed plans have not been adequately addressed by the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) as is required. Should the environmental changes impact our communities?? sport (as it would in Plans D, E, & F) we would be forced to reconsider our frequent and environmentally friendly utilization of the Outer Banks. Other user groups such as surfers, fishermen, beachcombers, and virtually all other forms of tourism will also be discouraged from visiting Cape Hatteras if beach closures are greatly expanded. This will have a severely negative impact on the local economy and way of life that the residents of Hatteras Island have enjoyed for many generations. It will also take away something that is important to the lives of thousands of people throughout the United States and around the world. If people, and especially children, can not experience the environment how are they going to learn to help you protect the environment?

Kind Regards,

Dr. Randall Mayberry

**Correspondence ID:** 3904    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Mc Cabe, Kevin  
**Received:** Apr,28,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** April 28, 2010

Dear Mike,

I have reviewed the 800 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 culture. There has been a longstanding heritage of commercial and recreational fishing at the Point that has fed families and this nation for centuries. It has been a social gathering place of people for many generations. Cape Point is a Mecca for surf fishing, birding, shelling, windsurfing, surfing, and many other recreational activities. It is a destiny for many Park visitors. I understand too that it is the southern most breeding area for a very limited number of piping plovers and only when the conditions are just right!

The National Park has always done a decent job helping these species. But neither you nor I are responsible for their fluctuating numbers. Storms and avian 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 near the Cape Point area are necessary and I have always endorsed them as long as shore side access is provided. I spent the last several months reviewing piping plover data at Cape Point. Over a ten-year period, all the data showed that almost every chick hatched in an enclosure has traveled west towards the salt pond or lateral dune, never east to the north beach or ocean! I know my birds and their activities very well after observing them for over 40 years.

Please look at that data very closely when making final decisions at Cape Point. There is no reason access to the Point should ever be denied when the area is being monitored by so many Park biologists and the enclosures are properly in place. The special interest groups, Audubon, SELC, and DOW that created the latest outrageous buffers did this with little or no scientific justification and most intelligent people question their true motives. The buffers also prohibit birding, which I have thoroughly enjoyed at the Point for over 30 years. I would also like to know what they done to help increase shore bird numbers in my National Park? So far and with multiply opportunities, they have done absolutely nothing. Their influence should be very limited when the final plan is drawn up. I'm sure they will sue again regardless. In closing Mike, please keep this in mind. If the American people really knew what was going on out here, we would not be here tonight. Also remember what just happened in the 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. The repercussions will be heard loud and clear this November and our congress will look deep into the current issues here. Our 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. I don't hear anyone screaming "I want my National Park closed" Do you? Do not confuse other areas of the Park with historic Cape Point. The Point is a very special place?. Please give it the full respect it deserves. Has always Mike, thanks for your hard work and remember, it's about access.

Sincerely,

Kevin Mc Cabe PO Box 743 Buxton, N.C. 27920

**Correspondence ID:** 3905    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Zacharias, Walter M  
**Received:** Apr,17,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** Mr. Murray,

I would like to voice my support of HR718 and Senate Bill 1557, requesting the overturn of the consent deal and the return of Cape Hatteras National Seashore to the National Park Service's management under the interim Protected Species Management Strategy.

Sincerely Walter M. Zacharias Cleveland, Ohio

**Correspondence ID:** 3906    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Westervelt, Frederic and Ernestine  
**Received:** Apr,21,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** 25 HOWARD STREET PO BOX 505 OCRACOKE, NORTH CAROLINA 27960-0505 fwestervelt@pol.net

21 April, 2010

Superintendent Michael Murray Cape Hatteras National Seashore 1401 National Park Drive Manteo, NC 27964 Re: CAHA DRY Management Plan DEIS

Dear Superintendent Murray:

However one views the thrust of the DEIS, one must admire its sheer weight, volume and thoroughness. Much of the bulk is repetitive text, making it difficult to pick out quickly the issues relevant to ORV on the beach. The page numbers in the index of the electronic version of DEIS do not correlate with the actual page numbers, rendering the electronic version less than fully useful. The binding is unusually effective, and is commendable.

I choose as my first comment topic one applicable to all Alternatives, the rationale for this herculean and objectionable effort. One would think that during the several decades of this controversy the environmental zealots would have had sufficient time and money to marshal unassailable data in support of their cause. But then, why would they bother when all they needed to do was refer to "existing law" and launch lawsuits, a plan carefully and incrementally laid before the affected populace became awakened to the alarm?

While the specified shorebirds may or not be endangered as claimed (pp. 319-419), it is not proven that this is in any way due to human activities on CAHA. And, one asks, how many birds are enough- what is the goal? Their habitat is not limited to the Outer Banks Recreational Area, and CAHA cannot be said to be their salvation. Indeed, this issue may be more an environmental political weapon than one of biologic concern.

The frequently released reports of the NPS regularly reveal that the "piping plover product" of CAHA Ocracoke, those which flyaway, rarely exceeds single digits annually. This is of no significance to species survival. In the period 1989-2009 the annual average fledge rate has been 0.27 for Ocracoke North Spit, 0.52 for South Point. DEIS further asserts (see Table 14, p. 186 and adjacent Fig. 3, p. 187) that whereas between 1986 and 2009 the number of breeding pairs of plovers doubled in Virginia ( 100 to 208) and elsewhere in North Carolina (30 to 64), the number remained constant and low (12 to 10) in CAHA. This points out that plovers seem to be doing fine- they simply don't like CAHA. So what? This is a perception problem of the environmental biologists, not of the birds. Much ado about nothing!

A. My first recommendation, doubtless tardily futile, is to buttress any plan with solid justification. It must be clear to all that this major upheaval in really necessary! The impacted public might then be more tolerant of any resulting restrictions.

Secondly, one is struck by the fractious designation of sarn. luary areas, rather than unifying bird reserves more logically. While the literate public will be able, though often under protest, to observe these divisions, one suspects the birds will frequently transgress; and we all know what will happen then. Much too contrived and fussy.

Efforts to share area between conservation and recreation, including ORV, are complex, costly, subject to ephemeral schedules and fraught with conflict. Efforts to reach a compromise here have fail ed. Surely the birds do not necessarily like the same area as do people, nor do they need the same area for so few as do we for so many. What's wrong? The answer- bird advocates do not want to compromise; they want it all. For example, consider the ridiculous buffer areas granted to plover and other hatchlings (up to 1000 meters radius). Such a circle, for just one bird, equals roughly 1.22 square miles (about 780 acres), or three-quarters the area of Ocracoke Village with its more than 1000 human houses, lodgings and shops. Such arbitrary regulations make a mockery of any authoritative exercise.

8. My second recommendation is, to reconsider and revise in detail the necessary preserve areas and realistic buffer areas so as to maximize the human

access and minimize their perceived over-regulation. Designating North Ocracoke Spit as permanent non-ORV can have no basis in real fact and will seriously compromise fishing, especially commercial, itself already under regulatory siege. To set aside the entirety of Ocracoke South Point, for instance, for the benefit of a handful of birds is insulting to us and to our guests, gives NPS a terrible image and depresses our economy. In closing, those of us who reside and work on the Outer Banks are distressed by the clumsy analysis of the threatened impact (pp. 561-598) of even Alternative F upon our lifestyle and livelihoods. The imperious third paragraph, suggesting that it is we who should change our lives and that our monetary loss would merely be someone else's gain, is beyond offensive. It is the birds who should change, as they have (see paragraph. 4, above) with resultant no net loss. The ongoing socioeconomic study, still far from complete, will appear too late to influence the commentary or the decision, a sorry state in these days of economic hardship.

We deserve better. You can do better.

Sincerely and with best wishes,

Frederic B. And Ernestine H. Westervelt The Cove Bed and Breakfast

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3907    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Sharp, Bob and Becky  
**Received:** Apr,20,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** As 26-year vacationers to the Outer Banks, NC, we feel such affection for it. It is a 750 mile drive from our home in Kentucky. The vacations we always thoroughly enjoy are the reason for our yearly return. It is truly a family vacation area.... something for everyone. In reading the lengthy documents, it is too obvious, that the NPS insists upon rights to close any or all areas at will, for any number of reasons that appear to be unreasonable and lacking overall vision for the entire picture. Birds are endowed with wings by our Creator ... they can stay or flyaway. All efforts to mandate their nesting grounds, flight path, etc. is absurd. The only way to possibly keep any bird in any area man insists upon for them is to cage them and feed them, as they do in a zoo. You can turn the whole Outer Banks into a bird sanctuary (SHUDDER!) and still not achieve your goal. If the OBX becomes as drastically altered as you and the special interest groups propose.... please note, I did not say the people of the United States ..... our rights are no longer considered in this decree, we will no longer be interested in visiting a governmentally run recreation area, which will not be for recreation. May I emphasize that the MAJORITY vote as the deciding factor in this country has worked beautifully up to this point. Why is the Pea Island Sanctuary unsatisfactory for these Piping Plovers.... isn't it a designated area? Why do you not consider Portsmouth Island for your "bird mandated nesting area" ... it has few inhabitants and would work out well with mosquitoes for feeding them. Regarding your control of the number of people allowed on the beach at a time, there are Super Bowls, NCAA Tournaments, NFL Games, College games of all sorts, where tens of thousands of people congregate in an enclosed building and you are worried about the safety of several families on an open beach? Sorry, folks, that one defies logic. One more thought... the Outer Banks pioneer families who donated this marvelous seashore area to the Federal Government for a National Recreation Area, did so as a perpetual hope that all people would be able to enjoy the fishing, swimming, shelling and boating advantages. These proposals shamefully abuse their gift to this country by closing all access to the beaches that they gave us. If they were alive today and could consider these intended rules, they would forego their gift.... ask their heirs. Please reconsider; let us keep America the Home of the Free. Thank You, Most Sincerely, Bob & Becky Sharp 893 N. Homestead Lane Lancaster, KY 40444

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3908    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 10:53:42  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please keep the Hatteras beach access open to everyone, this is our family trip every year and we would like to keep coming back!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3909    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Sharp, Bob and Becky  
**Received:** Apr,20,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** We cannot believe the direction those in authority in the United States are taking. We are 70 and 75 years of age. In our entire lifetime, Americans were all on the same page ... one for all and all for one. Why is this changing? It seems there is a large faction within our own ranks that is corrupting America from the inside out. We worked all our lives and paid taxes to have a better life for ourselves, children, grandchildren and those who were truly disabled. Fast forward to 2010 and you will see the officials (do we need to include the NPS?) as opponents of the law abiding citizens of America. The mindset is that our rights are optional; our tax money belongs to anyone shrewd enough to claim it and any special interest group that foots the bill for a "buyout" to get a law changed to fit their particular program. Sad. Do you all see where this is headed? Socialism, here we are at your door... It is time for all of us to Just Say No. The NPS has always been a group of nature loving individuals that enjoys the freedom of vast free land. Please keep this agenda! Do not get into this absurd disappearing plant and bird protection theory that is just a guise to control areas that some want to control. We only ask that you assert yourselves to continue to do your job as "keeper of the peace" and overseers of a vital area of America. Have you failed to consider the hard working, forever tax paying citizens that served in the military , or those who worked in factories in crowded Eastern United States cities with the dream that when retirement came, they would relocate to the OBX to enjoy the serenity it offers? These are the people that have paid and do pay your salary. Up to now, they have been respectful of your profession. This will change with your new mandates. You will no longer be respected ... you will be considered the opponent, as you will have to be the ones enforcing these absurd restrictions. If the O8X becomes as drastically altered as you and the special interest groups propose, we will no longer be interested in visiting a governmentally run recreation area, which will not be recreational. Would we even consider taking a governmental "bus" to view the ocean and sunset (for a fee, mind you) and be back within the hour to unload so they could get another load of "tourists"? Or, wait in long lines to obtain tickets to go to the beach. Talk about a waste of time, yours and ours. Why was the Pea Island Sanctuary set aside in the first place if it is unsatisfactory for these Piping Plovers and all those other fabricated specimens of impending extinction? Why do you not consider Portsmouth Island for your "bird mandated nesting area" ... it has few inhabitants and would work out well with mosquitoes for feeding them. And, here's a new thought ... perhaps those birds are nesting and living where you have never even visited. Birds and animals are blessed with instinctive gifts. They know where they need to live and what they need to do to perpetuate their species. They constantly surprise mankind as they "outsmart them ... ask National Geographic photographers. One more thought... the Outer Banks pioneer families who donated this marvelous seashore area to the Federal Government for a National Recreation Area, did so as a perpetual hope that all people would be able to enjoy the fishing, swimming, shelling and boating advantages. These proposals shamefully abuse their gift to this country by closing all access to the beaches that they gave us. If they were alive today and could consider these intended rules, they would forego their gift.... ask their heirs. Please reconsider. Let us keep America the Home of the Free. Thank You, Most Sincerely, Bob & Becky Sharp 893 N. Homestead Lane Lancaster, KY 40444

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3910	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	
<b>Name:</b>	Medlin, Katie					
<b>Received:</b>	Apr.20,2010 00:00:00					
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Letter					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>Mike Murray, Superintendent Cape Hatteras National Seashore 1401 National Park Drive Manteo, NC 27954  Katie Medlin P.O. Box 453 Buxton, N.C. 27920  Attn: Mr. Murray,  My husband and I have for many years (he is 85, I'm 84) enjoyed riding to the beach to see the deer and other wildlife and watch the beautiful sunsets. At our age we are unable to walk over. Please help us to be able to continue to do this.  Please consider also that the high tides will continue to destroy the grasses and some of the other things and interest from the environment. Nature will prevail.  If this area was intended to be a habitat for these birds, it would have been in place for many years and would not cost millions of dollars and man power to try to free it. Pear Island would be the perfect solution or Portsmouth Island.  It concerns me deeply that animals are being trapped and destroyed in the natural habitat.  Thank you Katie Medlin</p>					
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3911	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	
<b>Name:</b>	Jordan, Lynn B					
<b>Received:</b>	Apr.21,2010 00:00:00					
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Letter					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>Mrs. Lynn B. Jordan P.O. Box 734 Rodanthe, NC 27968 April 21, 2010  Dear Mr. Murray,  I support open ORV beach access on cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area. I have read the DEIS Plan F and hope it can be revised to consider the original purpose of this recreational seashore as stated by the federal government upon acquiring the land in 1937.  SUBCHAPTER LXIII - NATIONAL SEASHORE RECREATIONAL AREA (CH_459, SEC-1, 54STAT_702) Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area ..... 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 Recreational Area.....  Hatteras Island is approximately 60 miles long. If 30 miles of the island were devoted to wildlife preservation and protection, birds would naturally flock to those areas. They can also nest on hundreds of barrier islands in the Pamlico Sound, where eggs would be much less likely to be destroyed by predators. Nest discovered elsewhere can be roped off for protection as they were prior to 2008. (DEIS p.24)  Turtle nests can be roped off as well or eggs could be moved to Pea Island Wildlife Refuge. Eggs are only moved now prior to storms, which have proven to be more detrimental to the hatchlings than ORV's_ (DEIS p.87, p_119,p_125.p.392-396)_  The villages of Hatteras Island could be restored to their original purpose as a recreational area open to ORV use by the public. This would assure the NPS compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act. Which is questionable under Plan F. (DEIS page. 1) It would be a show of support by the NPS for the socioeconomic growth of the island, which cannot survive without ORV access. The NPS would be displaying its' respect for the traditions, culture and history of Hatteras Island, not considered in Plan F. And the NSP would be honoring the federal government's original contract with the people.  Please consider a drastic compromise to Plan F and support the citizens of Hatteras Island. This is the perfect opportunity to restore human relations between the NPS and the people, who have worked together so diligently in the past to preserve and protect wildlife and accommodate tourists. Without tourism Hatteras Island cannot survive economically! And without ORV access to the beaches, tourism here will cease to exist!  Respectfully, Lynn Jordan</p>					
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3912	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	
<b>Name:</b>	Hicks, Thomas					
<b>Received:</b>	Apr.19,2010 00:00:00					
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Letter					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>Thomas Hicks 785 Valley Summit Dr Roswell, GA 30075  Property Owner 27243 Park Rd Salvo, NC 27972  April 19, 2009  Mike Murray, Superintendent Cape Hatteras National Seashore 1401 National Park Drive Manteo, NC 27954  Subject Cape Hatteras National Seashore Off? Road Vehicle Management Plan / Environmental Impact Statement  Dear Mr. Murray  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 non-breeding 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.  Your attention to this matter is greatly appreciated.  Sincerely,  Thomas Hicks &amp; Claudia Hicks  Cc: Coalition for Beach Access</p>					
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3913	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b> Y
<b>Name:</b>	private					
<b>Received:</b>	May.06,2010 10:58:50					
<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:** 3914    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 10:58:57

**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:** 3915    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** HARRIS, Scott W

**Received:** Apr,22,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** SCOTT W. HARRIS P.O. BOX 734 RODANTHE, NC 27968

April 22, 2010

Dear Mr. Murray,

I support free and open beaches on Hatteras Island. Due to the landform, beaches here cannot be accessed by the physically challenged or by those whose recreational sports require fishing gear, coolers, surfboards, umbrellas, etc. ORV access ramps are part of our tradition and the main attraction that sets Hatteras Island apart from other beaches. Without our access ramps tourists will no longer come here. The economy will die. Many of my neighbors and I will be forced to move from a place we love.

I am appealing to you to amend Plan F of the DEIS. I am in favor of a compromise that considers the rights of wildlife as well as the rights of man. I love the wildlife here and have supported the NPS in its' efforts to preserve and protect wildlife for years, but Plan F is not a plan the citizens of Hatteras Island can live with.

Sincerely,  
Scott Harris

**Correspondence ID:** 3916    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 11:00:11

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Parks Department, Of the proposed plans I support Plan D (the most restrictive and predictable plan) and strongly oppose Plan F (the least restrictive). I am a stakeholder in that I own a home on Hatteras Island and plan to relocate there full time in the next few years. I am a US Citizen and I vote regularly. I applaud the hard work of the Parks Department in this difficult task. The positive features common to all the plans are: More permanent access points for pedestrian only beach use. Permitting of vehicles resulting in fewer vehicles on the beach Restriction or elimination of night time beach driving Greater predictability of when and where beach driving will and will not be allowed.

The argument about beach driving at the Cape Hatteras National Seashore has been dominated by some loud voices and organized groups. One group maintains that people have the right to drive on the beach; the other is opposed to beach driving because of the damaging effects on sensitive and endangered wildlife. These views seem to have also dominated the plans drawn up by the Park Service. While I support Plan D of the current options, I think it misses a major point of view, one that I share. I am opposed to beach driving on National Seashores for reasons that go beyond wildlife protection. I value beaches and do not want to spend my precious beach time in the presence of ORV's, their noise, their fumes, and the tracks they leave on the beach. I think I speak for hundreds of thousands of beach goers whose voice has been silenced by intimidation. On Hatteras Island it is difficult to

0009878

express this anti-driving point of view because of a small, very vocal minority of people who feel economically threatened by closing the beach to driving. When the draft plans go to the next stages, I ask you to include this aesthetic view about beach driving more explicitly. I strongly suspect that at present the majority of vacationers who come to the Cape Hatteras National Seashore are opposed to beach driving. Most of the cars I see at rental cottages are ordinary sedans and mini-vans, not the 4X4's required for beach driving. Most of the vacationers I talk to would like to see all beach driving curtailed. This is a very prevalent view but one, I fear, you are either not hearing or not responding too. As a final thought there are several ways that more of the Hatteras beaches could be made available to more people while at the same time having much less beach driving. 1) More ocean side parking areas with pedestrian access ramps. "Beach busses"- large tired busses that would run on selected areas of the beach and drop off and pick up people and their gear for a fee. A plan like this might provide some employment to those who now depend on beach driving.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3917    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Beeber, Alfred  
**Received:** Apr,16,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** 4/16/2010

My name is Alfred Beeber, NCBBA34. I have been driving on and fishing from the beaches at the outer banks for 40 years. I also swim and surf from these same beaches and observe all that nature has to offer. It is, after all, a fabulous place. Over these many years I have watched the NCBBA grow as well as growing use by the general public. It has been clear that these people have with the help of the Park Service, politicize themselves in an effort to preserve all that nature provides. There are so many common sense ways, that the government, the special interest groups and the folks who just want to have access as they have in the past, they can't all be listed here. I have tried to understand the 50 page "executive summary" and probably have been that successful. I was told several years ago that the ultimate goal for the Park Service and the special interest folks was to shut the beach down to all ORV traffic and most foot traffic. It kills me to say but now I believe that statement to be true. Shame on everybody  
Alfred Beeber

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3918    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 11:02:29  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:**

The beautiful beaches on Hatteras Island should remain open for many reasons - primarily for the survival of a way of life for all of the permanent residents. Without a doubt, their livelihoods are being threatened, as tourism impacts nearly every single person there. As for me, I visit at least once a year, most often times more. Now, I don't plan vacations in advance because I feel that I need to wait to see if the beaches are open to driving before leaving the house. I'm sure others have made similar decisions. What's more important? Birds or people? I also understand that in protecting these birds and turtles, several fox and feral cats have been murdered by the NPS. What makes their lives less important than the plovers? Doesn't make sense to me. I am in favor of saving the people, not a silly bird.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3919    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Lauby, John A  
**Received:** May,06,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Mr. Murray,

It has been brought to the attention of the kiteboarding community that a variety of plans are being considered in response to proposed environmental and ecological concerns. The Outer Banks of North Carolina is a sanctuary for many beach goers, sports enthusiasts, wildlife observers and most importantly, the natural environment. We, as a community, feel that it is important for the environment to be protected and thus understand certain steps may be 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 away 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 wildlife. We strongly feel that the Historical, Cultural, and Economic ramifications of the proposed plans have not been adequately addressed by the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) as is required. Should the environmental changes impact our communities' sport (as it would in Plans D, E, & F) we would be forced to reconsider our frequent and environmentally friendly utilization of the Outer Banks. Other user groups such as surfers, fishermen, beachcombers, and virtually all other forms of tourism will also be discouraged from visiting Cape Hatteras if beach closures are greatly expanded. This will have a severely negative impact on the local economy and way of life that the residents of Hatteras Island have enjoyed for many generations. It will also take away something that is important to the lives of thousands of people throughout the United States and around the world. If people, and especially children, can not experience the environment how are they going to learn to help you protect the environment?  
Kind Regards, John A. Lauby DVM, CVCP

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3920    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Mr. Murray,

It has been brought to the attention of the kiteboarding community that a variety of plans are being considered in response to proposed environmental and ecological concerns. The Outer Banks of North Carolina is a sanctuary for many beach goers, sports enthusiasts, wildlife observers and most importantly, the natural environment. We, as a community, feel that it is important for the environment to be protected and thus understand certain steps may be 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 away 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 wildlife. We strongly feel that the Historical, Cultural, and Economic ramifications of the proposed plans have not been adequately addressed by the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) as is required. Should the environmental changes impact our communities' sport (as it would in Plans D, E, & F) we would be forced to reconsider our frequent and environmentally friendly utilization of the Outer Banks. Other user groups such as surfers, fishermen, beachcombers, and virtually all other forms of tourism will also be discouraged from visiting Cape Hatteras if beach closures are greatly expanded. This will have a severely negative impact on the local economy and way of life that the residents of Hatteras Island have enjoyed for many generations. It will also take away something that is important

0009879

to the lives of thousands of people throughout the United States and around the world.  
If people, and especially children, can not experience the environment how are they going to learn to help you protect the environment?  
Kind Regards,

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3921    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** newman, james a  
**Received:** May,06,2010 11:25:05  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am opposed to instituting the most restrictive alternative F level of management in the Cape Hatteras National Seashore. It is too restrictive of taxpayer use of the park. the current interim level of management seems to be an effective balance between protecting wildlife and permitting the enjoyment of the park by people and their pets

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3922    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 11:28:52  
**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:** 3923    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 11:28:52  
**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:** 3924    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Gray, Thomas B  
**Received:** May,06,2010 11:34:45  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Times Do Change. For the summers of 1962, 1963, and 1964, I had to opportunity to work for the National Park Service at the Coquina Beach and Buxton lifeguarding stations. I watched with intensity at the way NPS Rangers like Balfour Baum and Wes Kreiss mingled with the local population and maintained our campgrounds as well as our beaches - for as a graduating college senior I was looking at joining the NPS. I am so glad I made the decision NOT to join the NPS for I do not believe I could have changed into someone who obviously does not care about the local population and instead of maintaining our campgrounds and beaches is concerned only with CLOSING our beaches and campgrounds to people. WHAT A NEGATIVE CHANGE THIS HAS BECOME!!  
This year I have attended some of the "regneg" meetings and watched the National Park Service cower to the demands of the environmentalists as the "negotiations" were torpedoed so that nothing was accomplished. It is one thing to negotiate with good faith, but it is another to negotiate from the standpoint of prior knowledge that the outcome has been already decided upon.  
I have watched quietly when so many friends of mine have lost their homes and businesses/jobs due to the beach closures and I feel ashamed that I have not spoken out against this sham dictated by a judge that has a conflict of interest to begin with.

0009880

I truly feel that this letter is an exercise in futility because the National Park Service is so tied to the environmentalists and congressional members who are paid by these environmentalists that an individual person does not count any more. You are so wrapped up with the Southern Environmental Law Center, Friends of Wildlife, and Audobon Society that you no longer care for the residents and visitors that you were originally mandated to support. I hope the pendulum changes before you lose all credibility with the people of this county and country. It is my hope that you realize our frustrations with the NPS before it becomes really confrontational beyond repair.

God bless this country - maybe prayer is our only way to resolve the situation - and I pray for true return to the "old" National Park Service spirit of cooperation and care. There is room for the environmental concerns and the people on Hatteras Island. I do not want to feel alienated by my government.

Thomas B. Gray PO Box 847 Buxton, NC 27920

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3925    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** AIKEN, JEFFREY K  
**Received:** May,06,2010 11:39:46  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** THANK YOU FOR THIS OPPORTUNITY TO COMMENT ON THESE PROPOSALS THAT WILL VERY DRAMATICALLY EFFECT THE LIVES OF BOTH RESIDENTS AND VISITORS THAT TRULY LOVE AND RESPECT THE NATURAL AND CULTURAL RESOURCES THIS PROCESS IS MANDATED TO PROTECT.  
ROUTES AND AREAS  
I AGREE WITH THE TRADITIONAL MAY 15 TO SEPT 15 ORV ACCESS CLOSURES FOR FRISCO, HATTERAS, AND OCRACOCKE BUT I DISAGREE WITH THE ALTERNATIVE POSITION OF LONGER CLOSURES OF THESE AREAS BECAUSE IT IS DISCRIMANATORY WITHOUT GOOD REASON.  
CLOSURES DUE TO BIRDS  
I AGREE THAT NESTING ENDANGERED SPECIES SHOULD BE PROTECTED. I DISAGREE WITH THE PROPOSED ML1 AND ML2 RESTRICTIONS AS THEY ARE OVERLY RESTRICTIVE. PEDESTRIAN AND ORV BYPASSES SHOULD BE PROVIDED YEAR ROUND. I AGREE THAT REASONABLE BUFFERS SHOULD BE ESTABLISHED TO PROTECT ENDANGERED SPECIES. I DISAGREE WITH THE LARGE, INFLEXIBLE BUFFERS PROPOSED IN THE ML1 AND ML2 SCENARIOS AS THEY ARE EXTREME AND UNECESSARY. I RECOMMEND THAT OTHER INITIATIVES BE IMPLEMENTED TO ADDRESS THE FAILURES OF ENDANGERED SPECIES AND THAT THE HUMAN INTERFERENCE IMPACT TAKE ITS PLACE AND BE REGULATED ACCORDING TO ITS WELL ESTABLISHED LESS SIGNIFICANT STATUS.  
CLOSURES DUE TO TURTLES  
I AGREE THAT ENDANGERED TURTLES ARE BEST PROTECTED BY REMOVAL OF NESTS TO SAFE AREAS OR HATCHERIES FOR INCUBATION AND BY ADOPTING PROACTIVE TECHNIQUES USED AT OTHER EAST COAST LOCATIONS. I DISAGREE WITH ROUND THE CLOCK CLOSURE FROM NEST TO SURF LINE AND DISAGREE THAT MAJOR ADVERSE EVENTS HAVE RESULTED FROM ORV USE.  
CULTURAL / HISTORICAL VALUES  
I AGREE WITH THE PURPOSES SET FORTH IN NEPA TO PROTECT AND PRESERVE NATURAL AND CULTURAL RESOURCES. I DISAGREE THAT THE DEIS ADEQUATELY ADDRESSES THE ISSUE OF "CULTURAL" IMPORTANCE TO OUTER BANKS COMMUNITIES. AS ILLUSTRATED ON THE FRONT COVER OF THIS DEIS DOCUMENT, COMMERCIAL AND RECREATIONAL FISHING ALONG WITH OTHER ACTIVITIES SUCH AS FAMILY OUTINGS, WEDDINGS, FUNERALS, SUNRISE SERVICES AND MANY OTHER CULTURAL USES DATE BACK HISTORICALLY SINCE MAN SET FOOT ON THESE BEACHES AND PUBLIC AREAS.  
SOCIOECONOMIC ANALYSIS I AGREE THAT THE SOCIOECONOMIC ANALYSIS IN THE DEIS ARE INCOMPLETE AT BEST AND FLAWED IN MANY AREAS. I DISAGREE THAT THE GUIDANCE SET FORTH IN NEPA, TO PRESERVE "CULTURAL" RESOURCES IN THE DECISION MAKING PROCESS, HAS BEEN MET.  
OTHER AREAS OF INTEREST  
I AGREE THAT PETS SHOULD BE ALLOWED YEAR ROUND IN ALL OPEN AREAS PROVIDED THEY ARE KEPT ON A 6 FOOT LEASH. I DISAGREE WITH PROHIBITION OF PETS BECAUSE THERE ARE TO MY KNOWLEDGE NO RECORDED INCIDENCES OF PETS AS PREDATORS. MANY, MANY VISITORS COME TO OUR BEACHES BECAUSE WE DO ALLOW THEM TO BRING THEIR PETS. ELIMINATING THEM WOULD CREATE ADDITIONAL ECONOMIC IMPACT FOR RESIDENTS AS WELL AS OWNERS AND MANAGERS OF SEASONAL RENTAL PROPERTY.  
I AGREE THAT VISITOR EDUCATION OFFERS THE BEST OPPORTUNITY FOR INCREASING AWARENESS OF POLICIES AND ACCOMPLISHING THE GOALS OF NEPA.  
SINCERELY, JEFF AIKEN

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3926    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Hart, Linda K  
**Received:** May,06,2010 11:42:23  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am writing in support of open and accessible beaches for Hatteras and Ocracoke Islands. I have been blessed to be able to enjoy these beaches for the past 25 years and the thought that this may no longer be possible because of possible closures under DEIS is horrifying..to think that not only visitors, but the good citizens of these communities could not have access to our country's FREE coastline and their homes is nauseating. The fact that those of us who frequent these areas ( or used to be able to frequent them ) love them and treasure them and do all we can to take care of them is self-evident. The Dare County Position Statement as that of the Coalition for Beach Access have documented proof that the proposals under the NPS's DEIS are just wrong and even unconstitutional. How could the NPS even consider robbing Americans of guaranteed rights provided by our constitution and subsequent legislation. I BEG you to PLEASE KEEP GOD'S BEACHES OPEN. Thankyou, Linda Hart

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3927    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Mr. Mike Murray, Supt. Cape Hatteras National Seashore 1401 National Park Drive Manteo, NC 27954  
Supt. Murray  
Please accept this letter as my comment on the ORV DEIS before you at this time.  
After reviewing the NPS DEIS I must disagree with any of the six alternatives within the document.  
I have; however, reviewed the 77 page Coalition for Beach Access Statement signed by several groups that were a part of the negotiated rule making process and it by far succeeds in furnishing the best visitor experience while maintaining the needs of protecting the fragile resources.  
Please consider all aspects of this alternative and put people back into the management of Cape Hatteras National Seashore.  
Sincerely David Montague

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3928    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 11:57:06

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:**

Over and over during the many years my husband and I have been vacationers and property owners on Ocracoke Island, we have heard the island described as "a special place." Visitors love Ocracoke for its miles of unspoiled beaches and the ability to four-wheel to remote areas of the island to swim, fish, read, and walk for miles. This is what makes Ocracoke "a special place" -- and you want to make drastic changes in these unique characteristics -- changes that will affect tourism, property values, and the livelihoods of many local residents!

I understand the concern for the birds and turtles, and I've observed that the vast majority of visitors who enjoy the remote areas of the island are careful and respectful of the wildlife. Yes, I know there are those who drive haphazardly into wildlife areas and disrupt nests. Fine those offenders, and ban them from driving on the beach. But don't punish all the residents and visitors who love this "special place" for the irresponsible actions of a few. The National Seashore belongs to the people (taxpayers) of the United States. We insist on the right to use and enjoy our investment.

Carol Self

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3929    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 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 very concerned about the rare birds and sea turtles for which Cape Hatteras is famous.

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

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3930    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 12:08:16

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:**

I have been going to Cape Hatteras and Ocracoke Islands to fish,camp and drive on the beach since I was about 5 years old,now at 42 years old and owning several surf fishing style vehicles and I don't even want to add up the amount of money I have spent on fishing and camping equipment over the years I am now being told I may not be allowed to drive on the beach there anymore !!! WHY? WHY can't you guys stop all this crap and make a decision on the new rules for an ORV plan? do you realize that if you get closed down that these groups will start attacking every other place you can do recreational 4 wheeling from the other Government owned beaches to the Moun tains and Deserts???

Here is my idea PLEASE read it and think LONG and HARD about it :

First off, it needs to be a PERMIT system only !! for the purpose of SURF FISHING only open all year 24 hrs a day.

This would stop most people who come down just for a quick ride that tear up the beaches as well as do do-nuts and bring ATVs to ride.

You could charge 100.00 per vehicle PER YEAR and either give out a sticker or a metal plate like they do in Delaware.Fees could vary for instate,out of state and Dare County land owners

You could also come up with a plan for a FREE permit for Commercial fishermen,guides etc as well as a GROUP fee for the rental companies to offer a renter,this way NO ONE loses out on revenue which as you know keeps Hatteras Island open.

You should really STOP listening to Jim Keene of the NCBBA as he is against the permit system totally,as well as he is against people like me fishing from my 2 wheel drive van on the beach.

I love coming to Hatteras to fish off the Point, but if this crap gets the beaches closed I like many others will NEVER come south of Nags Head ever again,thus Hatteras and Ocracoke will have to survive off familes in mini vans who never drive on the beach,bird watchers and surfers the fishermen will be gone !!! Just go drive out on the beach and count the num ber of vehicles are out there and figure at least 1 Salt Water Liscense per vehicle and how many rods do most of them have on them? All that money will be gone as well as most of your jobs.

If any of this interests you I would love to talk in person about it further,my name is James Dorn and my cell number is 757-672-1044 and I can drive down and go over some of this at your convenience afterall I am FOR OPEN BEACHES !!!!

Thanks for reading

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3931    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 12:35:28

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:**

I support the position of the OBPA on the specific sections of DEIS.

I do not support DEIS alternative F as overly restrictive to ORVs relative to other alternatives that better balance the needs of all users of national seashore. This lack of balance is clear in the lack of detail about "protecting and preserving cultural resources". I spent a great deal of time surf fishing in the 1970s in Virginia and North Carolina and have returned to the sport in the last few years. I view surf fishing as a cultural resource that is not well served by alternative F.

I do not support any alternative that results in the concentration of surf fishing activities in small areas. This will be the death of surf fishing as a cultural and local economic activity.

I do support the potection of all wildlife in and around the seashore. The focus on specific shore birds and turtles is misguided and ignores the systemic nature of natural systems.

Thank you for the opportunity to make these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3932    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 12:43:01  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Regulation may be necessary to manage the resource. Regulation applied with out balance will be unseccessful. Humans are part of the ecology and need access just as the birds need a place to next. Please balance the preservation of the natural area with the use and enjoyment of the area.

**Correspondence ID:** 3933    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 12:49:10  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I strongly disagree with the proposed changes to beach access. As an Ocracoke Island property owner and frequent visitor to the Outer Banks National Seashore, I am VERY concerned for the economic impact and detrimental impact on a visitors enjoyment of our National Seashor. This is yet another example of our government adding a layer of government control to our lives that, in reality, will not produce the benefits reported. I urge the NPS to work closely with the people who are knowledgeable in the local area to best manage our National Seashore serving the American people while preserving our environment. Some of the valid points and suggestions follow:  
This proposal will directly impact the future economic health of the Outer Banks. Directly affect the traditional, historica, and cultural uses of the Outer Banks? Determine the quality of life of the residents of Ocracoke and Hatteras Islands. The Benefits to Resources is negligble ? Impairment to Visitor Experience -Major ? Impairment to Local Economy -Major NPS should aggressively pursue the adaptive management initiatives identified in the DEIS with an object to improve its success with both resource protection and visitor access. The initiatives have been clearly identified in meetings with the NPS.  
Respectfully submitted, Connie J Bowlin

**Correspondence ID:** 3934    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 12:59:13  
**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.  
Pedestrian access is acceptable and encouraged, but not ORV, due to the disturbances that they cause. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. 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:** 3935    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Cullen, Lawrence D  
**Received:** May,06,2010 13:03:02  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Supt. Murray  
The choices offered have severe differences in harshness and planned implementation. Choice "F" has all the Park Service wants with little given to the access alliance and too much afforded to the "conservation groups." It hardly seems compromise minded in that the allowances that favor the conservation groups far exceed that of the alliance for open beaches. It appears to me that the changes attempted to be made by the Park "Service " far exceeds what is necessary to truly "share " the beach with ONE endangered species of birds that really don't inhabit this area in even mediocre numbers. Please, Mr Murray, strike a balance that creates true access and share the beach with all comers, not just those who will make our beaches a true recreation area not a vast wasteland ruled by a negligible bunch of avians.  
Thank you for your time and consideration.

**Correspondence ID:** 3936    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Watson, Ben  
**Received:** May,06,2010 13:03:17  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I would like to comment on the proposed ORV plan for Cape Hatteras National Seashore. I have been coming to Ocracoke Island for 15 years now. Sometimes I come down twice a year, each time I spend around \$2000 while I am vacationing. The primary reason we come to Ocracoke is the fact that we can drive on the beach, find a nice, private location and enjoy the surf, the fishing, and the islands beauty in general. If ORV usage were eliminated or greatly curtailed, I would no longer have a reason to come to Ocracoke. It would be ashame for such a beautiful place to be unaccessible to future generations. I do not believe this is what our countries leaders had in mind when they formed the Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The original intent was to allow all the citizens of this country to have access to a noncommercialized seashore. In 1937 when the park was created, people were already driving on the beach and the leaders saw no reason to stop it. Today, however some groups believe the national seashore was created for the benefit of birds and animals to the exclusion of human beings. The way I read the original declaration, this is not what was intended. This whole situation seems to exist because of the piping plover, the wilsons plover, the american oystercatcher, and the sea turtle. As an avid bird hunter and member of numerous conservation groups, I understand the need for habitat and nesting areas. On the Outer Banks the ORVs are not the problem. There have been only a couple of instances where an ORV has killed or injured one of these species. However, according to the NPS own reports, most of these species are killed by avian or mammalian predators. Eliminating or curtailing ORVs would do nothing to help these species and would only temporarily satisfy the extremist(antihuman) groups. An effective method of predator control and species protection from avian and mammalian predators would be far better for the species mentioned, and it wouldn't wreck the economies of Ocracoke and Hatteras Islands. Most importantly, my family would still have access to beautiful, unspoiled beach. Ben Watson,Elizabethton, TN.

**Correspondence ID:** 3937    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 13:15:26

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** My family has vacationed on the Outer Banks for 35 years, and before that, my wife's family vacationed there from the 1950's onward, pretty much since the establishment in 1953 of Cape Hatteras National Seashore . Obviously, there have been a lot of changes over the years, both to OBX in general and to the National Seashore (NS). It is my understanding that the NS was established for the mutual benefit of human beings and wildlife, and over the years, despite some minor confrontations, things have gone well. There has been a good compromise arrangement whereby the wildlife have continued to propagate themselves and the people have been nearby to enjoy them in their natural surroundings. This arrangement does not have to change significantly, if a plan is developed to define the boundaries for human beings, but it needs to be reasonable. Obviously the wildlife won't obey our rules, but they do abide by the rules of nature. They don't build their nests in the tidal regions and they don't invade the heavier human population places. That means that there are places where off-road-vehicles (ORVs) can travel and where people can walk, and there won't be any significant detriment to that wildlife. We taxpayers support the NS and the personnel who administer to its needs, but we don't do that so that we can't ever set wheel or foot there again. As our technology levels increase, more damage to the environment does not necessarily follow. For example, the use of 4-wheelers to monitor sea turtle nest areas. There we are using human technology to help the wildlife, and turtle nesting areas are safer from destruction by both man and animal predators. Restricting beach area access to certain times and to certain places for ORV and pedestrian traffic may be justified, but this must be reasonable and rational. The arrangement now in effect, with its severe limitations, is an open invitation for trouble from both sides. Humans will defy it because they abhor it, and nature will succumb to it because the forces of unchecked nature are ultimately more destructive than those of humans. For your decision, be wise; be vigilant; for your enemy walks about as a do-gooder, seeking how much wool he can pull over the eyes of realism. Remember that God put animals here on this earth for our enjoyment, that our stewardship might protect them, not hide their beauty away from our hearts.

**Correspondence ID:** 3938    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Pratt, George W

**Received:** Apr,25,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** George W. Pratt PO Box 294 Buxton, NC 27920 (252) 986-1517  
Mike Murry, Superintendent Cape Hatteras National Seashore 1401 National Park Drive Manteo, NC 27954  
I am writing to comment on the draft Cape Hatteras National Seashore Off-Road Vehicle Management Plan / Environmental Impact Statement. My comments in this letter deal with the title of the Plan/Statement.  
The term "off-road vehicle" implies in the eyes of the general public that people come to the Cape Hatteras National Seashore primarily to go "off-roading" in their highly modified vehicles with large knobby tires. It paints the picture of owners of the vehicles speeding up and down the beach, climbing dunes, running through enclosures and cutting "donuts" and figure eights in the sand. This maybe true of less than .001% of those that come to access the seashore in their vehicles, however the vast majority of those coming to the Park use multi-use family vehicles which also are capable of driving where there is no pavement. Most of the families in them care for the area and are conservationists wanting to not disrupt the ecology of the seashore they enjoy. Groups like the North Carolina Beach Buggy Association, in partnership with the Park Service, have done more to promote beach cleanup, beach respect, and research and protection of endangered species than other so call environmental groups. Most of the "bad" behavior on the beach is minimal. Some is done through ignorance. The Park Service does not have an educational or interpretive component that supports responsible beach use. They tend to use signs instead. The privilege of driving on the beach should include attendance in a mandatory interpretive program that stresses the responsibility and ethics of beach use. The Park Service once took great pride in its function as an educator, but has failed to offer what would be the most popular educational program at the seashore. While many would not agree, a reasonably priced permit system for beach driving is needed and might be used to fund this education. The inadequate funding of enforcement personnel in the Park also contributes to the problem of bad behavior by Park visitors.  
I do support the use of the word Environmental in the title, but would add the suffix "-ist." It is a political rather than a scientific term, and it implies that the impact statement will be more politically biased rather than scientific based in its underpinnings. Many people equate environmentalism with science, but it's a political and social movement. The impact statement will be politically correct and meant not to offend those who identify with the environmental movement and its organizations (which will sue the Park Service no matter what it does). These organizations which are more and more corporately funded and isolated from their membership take a very elitist view that only they understand the environment and that the public should be denied access to areas that they designate. Please do not change the wording to "Ecological Impact Statement." That implies that you have tried to study and understand the whole system of factors that influence the life cycle of species that use Hatteras Island during only part of their life cycle. It would imply that in framing your policies you understand and take into consideration what happens to species when they are away from the Park, and that you have a long term understanding of the history of it's cycles and changes in numbers not just 20 years of data. It would also imply that the document you have created is scientifically based rather than simply "legally defensible" from attacks by the environmental movement.  
I would also like to recommend that the word "recreation" put back in the official name of the Park. It implies that we value one of the reasons that the Park was established. Many of the newer parks established near urban areas continue to use "recreation" in their title, and don't try to maintain the fiction that they area "wilderness area." (As you go through the Park, it is not the tire tracks that let you know you are not in the wilderness it's all the signs.) Cape Hatteras is a highly modified environment near increasingly urbanize areas. It can give you the sense of wilderness. It is still a place of wonder where you can observe natural wonders in its vistas, flora and fauna; if you can access it.  
I would recommend the following title for the document: Cape Hatteras National Recreational Seashore Family Access Vehicle and Citizen Restriction Plan / Environmentalist Impact Statement. I suggest this because I think that it is a more honest fiction than the current title. Wording in the document should be changed to reflect the new title. When the document talks about restricting ORV and pedestrian access to areas of the seashore, it should be changed to read "restrict family access vehicles (FAV) and citizen access to their recreational seashore." The purpose of the document is to restrict the traditional uses by families and citizens to areas of the park, and the title ought to better reflect this truth. It would also better reflect the political bent of the project, and point out that it is under the control of some in the more elitist wing of the environmental movement. Anybody can sue you for anything, if they have the resources. If your document is created in consultation with Department of Interior lawyers with the objective of blocking all possible litigious actions, your document is already under their control. They will sue you irrespective of what you do.  
This letter is not meant to be factious or cynical. I simply have a respect for the power of words. I favor access to the seashore with restrictions (a permit system with a strong educational component in local ecology). I also favor laws, policies and procedures that protect the ecological needs of species when they have a realist chance of working, but I think most of your plans miss that target. I also have great respect for science, but I do not see much here. My suggestions are to remind the framers of this document that the words that are chosen to go into the document have perceptual, political and legal ramifications. They are tools that paint a picture and shape the perceptions of its audience and ultimately their social, political, and legal reality. Your document has the effect of creating federal laws that support or pervert the intentions of Congress or the executive orders of the President. Remember, "the best available science" is not science. Please, try not to unnecessarily restrict the freedom of access that citizens and families have to the seashore. Please, try not to unnecessarily destroy the economic viability of your neighbor's families. Please, try to protect access for future generations.  
More later.  
Sincerely, George Pratt

**Correspondence ID:** 3939    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 13:29:04

**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:** 3940    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

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

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

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

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

**Correspondence ID:** 3941    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 13:51:17

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** To Whom it may concern, As a homeowner on Hatteras Island, and long time lover of the natural beauty of the outer banks, I very strongly believe this island should be kept open to fishermen and pedestrians. I could understand roping off a nesting area as long as it is done with reason, using common sense. Very few if anyone would intentionally destroy the wildlife or the beaches. Please keep our lovely beaches open.

**Correspondence ID:** 3942    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Rubbo, Deborah J

**Received:** May,06,2010 14:01:04

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** As a property owner in Avon, NC I am quite concerned about the economic impact that the future plan will have upon the residents and property owners of Hatteras Island. In a local economy that is dependent upon seasonal tourism the radical changes will be detrimental to all. Given the state of the national economy these changes seem counterproductive in the quest to improve real estate conditions and unemployment rates in this area. While I recognize and fully agree with the need to preserve and protect for future generations I respectfully ask that you will consider the local people and economy and their future as well.

**Correspondence ID:** 3943    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

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

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

0009885

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3944    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 14:15:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** The Cape Hatteras National Seashore is not the place for unlimited off-road vehicle use. Allowing ORVs access to so much (52 miles) of the seashore inhibits its use by pedestrians and families, as well as threatens wildlife. At least half, if not more, of the beach should be available to those of us who are non-ORV users. That way we can safely relax and enjoy this true treasure in our state. ORV use should be prohibited year round in MOST areas of the park, not only a few, as one proposal currently suggests. The majority of this scenic seashore should be for the use of pedestrians and the flora and fauna native to the area. The continued protection and survival of this seashore and its wildlife should be the predominant factor driving any plan. Recreation comes second to the above goal, and should be consistent with protective measures for the park.  
I support Alternative D, the "environmentally preferred plan", of the environmental impact statement drafts and urge you to ONLY approve that plan, with some modifications for much greater pedestrian access.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3945    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Parkinson, James E  
**Received:** May,06,2010 14:19:59  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am a property owner on Hatteras Island. I strongly disagree with the provisions in Alternative "F" requiring a 1,000 meter pedestrian/ORV closure around any piping plover nest. This equals nearly 770 acres per brood. This is an unusually large arbitrary number without any facts supporting such a large area. I strongly disagree with a 300 meter closure for any American Oystercatcher nest or brood. This bird is not a federally threatened species. The analysis of the preservation of cultural resources on the island are woefully inadequate and the impact of this Plan on the economy of the island will be devastating.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3946    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 14:29:29  
**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.  
I think the sensitive wildlife should take priority over ORV use of the beaches. Plain and simple.  
Best,  
Chris Hill Conway, SC

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3947    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 14:29:29  
**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:** 3948    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Rettie, Dwight F  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** 136 Willow Pond Drive Morehead City, NC 28557-2611 April 25, 2010  
Mike Murray, Superintendent Cape Hatteras National Seashore 1401 National Park Drive Manteo, NC 27954  
Dear Mike:  
Enclosed are the comments I will use at the upcoming meeting in Buxton and are the comments you will receive from the Coalition of National Park Service Retirees relating to the DEIS on ORVs at Cape Hatteras.

Will you please see that these become a part of the official record.

Thank you.

Sincerely, Dwight F. Rettie

Cc: Rob Milne

Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement Relating to ORVs at Cape Hatteras National Seashore on behalf of the Coalition of National Park Service Retirees

My name is Dwight Rettie and I am here representing the Coalition of National Park Service Retirees. During the negotiated rule making process I was Alternate Delegate to Rob Milne who is now living in France. Rob extends his best wishes to all of those present at this hearing.

The Coalition of National Park Service Retirees is an organization of more than 600 former National Park Service employees, now retired, who wish in this way to remain connected to not only the National Park idea, but also to the present employees of the Park Service and to many of you sitting in this room whom we have had contact over the years and during the negotiated rulemaking process.

Both Rob and I were very much disappointed that it was not possible for the committee to arrive at a consensus document that could draw the support of both the Park Service and the myriad of outside interests representing people and organizations---often referred to as "stakeholders"---who have an interest in the subject matter of this hearing. We hope that past failures will result in new efforts to arrive at agreements in the future. We have every confidence that no one in this room wishes those efforts to fail.

As we have represented the Coalition, it has been our goal to avoid "taking sides" on individual issues as they came before the committee and that have been and will be raised by the DEIS.

WE saw our mission as one to represent visitors and potential visitors who are probably not at this meeting today. They are the great majority of the American people who are the true owners of Cape Hatteras National Seashore---not instead of, but rather in addition to everyone in this room and those that will attend subsequent hearings on this subject. We have seen this subject become so embroiled in local issues that keeping an eye on the long term needs of the park and the large numbers of people who now and in the future have an interest in this great national treasure. No matter how certain anyone may feel that their claim on this Seashore is more valid or of longer standing than anyone else's, this park does not belong to any of its users---but to them all, plus many more who will never have the opportunity to visit here.

I have spent long hours reading the DEIS---and I stand impressed by the quality of the work that went into its preparation and release---notwithstanding the vigor with which some people disagree with something in particular. It is a fine professional piece of work!

I would like to call everyone's attention to the ambitious programs contained in the preferred Alternative: more ramps and improvements to existing ones. More interdunal roads, more restrooms and other amenities, and improved monitoring of park resources of all kinds. I am convinced that the future holds great promise for this park. Profound disagreements that remain unresolved can delay or sink many of those ambitious undertakings. We hope these meetings are a new beginning and not merely more of the same disagreements that have made compromise so difficult---indeed, often impossible.

It seems unlikely to me that NPS will receive the money and staff needed to implement that preferred alternative in the face of the level of vigorous hostility that has had such a grip on efforts to negotiate.

It is time for a new beginning.

Thank you.

**Correspondence ID:** 3949    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Johnston, Gergana

**Received:** Apr,30,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** PO Box 312 Hatteras, NC 27943 April 29, 2010

Dear Superintendent Murray,

I am writing in reference to the DEIS proposed by the NPS.

I have been a horse owner in Frisco for 35 years. I disagree with restricting horse riding on the beach.

I do appreciate the opening of Open Ponds for horse riding. We will hopefully be able to continue riding on the beach. I have never seen any damage done to wildlife or vegetation by the horses.

Sincerely, Gergana Johnston

**Correspondence ID:** 3950    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Oden, Jane

**Received:** Apr,30,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** PO Box 342 Hatteras, NC 27943 April 29, 2010

Dear Superintendent Murray,

I am writing in reference to the DEIS proposed by the NPS. As an owner of a small business in Hatteras village, I am concerned about the negative impacts of beach closures. My business as well as many others on the island would suffer great losses.

I disagree with a highly restrictive plan and would urge those making the final decision to implement a compromise. Closures are necessary at times, but should be reasonable and fair to all ? both animals and visitors in the park. I would ask NPS officials to approach the decision making process with an open minded attitude.

Yours truly, Jane Oden

**Correspondence ID:** 3951    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Joos, Kevin R

**Received:** May,06,2010 14:35:21

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Of all of the options, Plan "C" I believe best represents the interests of all parties.

I am a strong supporter of ORV rights in the seashore and as a surfer, I take advantage of the off-road access to some of the best surfing breaks on the east coast as often as possible. Please consider that this national treasure is a one of a kind surf spot and that most surfers are environmentalists at heart and do their best to preserve the beach environment by disturbing as little as possible and respecting all creatures.

Please let us continue to access our favorite surfing spots with our four wheel drive vehicles and enjoy the lifestyle we have revered and lived for decades on the Outer Banks.

Thank you.

Kevin R. Joos Virginia Beach, VA

**Correspondence ID:** 3952    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Finley, Margaret and George

**Received:** Apr,30,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** Margaret E. and George B. Finley 50525 Timber Trail Post Office Box 522 Frisco, NC 27936 252-995-7882

April 29, 2010

Mike Murray, Superintendent Cape Hatteras National Seashore 1401 National Park Drive Manteo, NC 27954

Dear Mr. Murray:

0009887

I do not believe that the economic impact study in the DEIS is sufficient or factual.

The economic impact will affect: - Taxes we send to Raleigh from Dare County - The local job opportunities - Loss of revenue from sales tax, transfer tax, etc - Dare County will no longer be able to provide the services it now provides to its residents - Property values will decline more - Off island vendors will lose business and jobs - Ocracoke will lose day trippers and the additional revenues - More foreclosures due to loss of rental income - Skilled workmen will have to leave the island to seek employment - Graduating students will have fewer job opportunities and will have to seek employment off-island - The impact will be felt at new car dealerships in the state and in the region - The island food banks are overwhelmed  
The economic impact is Region and State wide. The meetings in Raleigh and Hampton underscore your acceptance and understanding of that fact. Yet, your study is flawed; it is not just Dare County that will suffer under the impact of your actions.  
George B. Finley Margaret E. Finley

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3953    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 14:40:07  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Keep the beaches open! Folks, I've lived here all of my life (father moved us here in 1964). For literally generations the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore have existed in a balance between the majestic beauty of nature that we are all in awe of and have tremendous respect for, all of us that were reared here have a respect for our natural resources beyond comprehension. The balance of this precious resource with the potential negative impact of mankind is something that is on the top of the mind of all in the area.  
With that said it is time that these environmental extremists be stopped, and this ridiculous discussion of closing beaches under the guise of protecting endangered species be set aside.  
The rhetoric has all been given, the drama has all been played out, and it is time to step back and decide if the culture of this region be allowed to continue with all of the due respect for our natural resources that we've shown over time, or will the environmental extremists be allowed to poke each other in the ribs at their next fat cat cocktail party and snicker at each other about what they were willing to pull off down there on the Outer Banks in successfully getting to get the government to close off the beaches to all.  
Beaches were meant to be enjoyed by all of Gods creatures....including human beings.  
Plese stop the madness and open up beaches to free access.  
Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3954    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Blevins, Terry  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** 4/29/10  
Mr. Murray, Sir  
I live in Buxton, North Carolina and I would like to briefly comment on two subjects that apply to me and my family in reference to the "DEIS" plan. The beach is our source of recreation. First: without the use of an "ORV" it would be impossible for me, my wife and my two children, one of which is only a toddler to have access to our beach. Pedestrian only areas discriminate against us and many others for various reasons.  
Secondly the socioeconomic impact of the "DEIS" plan impacts our family in a negative way. Both my wife and I work for a business that depends on tourism. Hatteras Island has some of the best surf fishing beaches in the world, that is why most visitors come here, and those are the visitors that support the business we work for.  
These are my concerns, and I hope for more consideration for not only myself, but also for the many visitors who come to enjoy our wonderful beaches.  
Thank You Terry Blevins Lori Lucky Terry Blevins

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3955    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Laughon, Stuart B  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** Stuart B. Laughon 4400 S. Ashlawn Drive Richmond, Virginia 23221  
April 27, 2010  
Mike Murray Superintendent Cape Hatteras National Seashore 1401 National Park Drive Manteo, NC 27954  
Dear Superintendent Murray,  
I am writing about the final results of the Plovers or the People. I truly believe the restrictions on Cape Hatteras would impact the people of the island so devastatingly that they would not be able to survive. It's quite a struggle as it is, but the laws the NPS want to add are "cruel and unusual punishment."  
I am a native of North Carolina and have been enjoying the beaches for over seventy years. We built a home in Avon about twenty five years ago and our children and grandchildren have come to love, cherish and respect this beautiful, unique slice of our country. We have always felt so fortunate to be a part of these exceptional people and their land. I truly believe the plans you have in sight now would ruin not only the Seashore itself, but also the people who have fought so hard and so long to make this their home.  
I urge you from the bottom of my heart to reconsider the "Off-Road Vehicle Management Plan" and the Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). My sincere thanks to you for considering my request and the many requests from others who love this small area of our great Country.  
Warmest regards, Stuart B. Laughon

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3956    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Rittenberg, JoAnne  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** April 25, 2010  
Dear Superintendent Murray,  
I want to thank you for listening to all the people who visit and value Cape Hatteras National Seashore. When it comes to ORV use at CHNS I prefer a more balanced approach. Therefore, I support Alternative Plan D in the draft environmental impact statement, if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
I believe that recreational use of this wonderful resource should put resource protection first, otherwise it will become just a pile of sand. The best scientific information should be used to protect the birds and turtles that also share our space at CHNS. They are dependent on us to allow them to exist--and for that they need more room and time to breed and raise their young. Migrating birds need safe stopover spots and wintering birds need resource rich areas to live.  
I am not asking that ORV use be eliminated just that it be reduced so that all of us ? birds ? turtles ? plants ? humans ? have a chance now and in the future to call the seashore home.  
I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras.  
Sincerely, JoAnne Rittenberg 52 Hillcrest Drive Weaverville, NC 28787

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3957    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.06,2010 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 vehicle access should be limited to access points only, allowing for the loading and unloading of materials for use on the beach. There should never be driving along the seashore in any case since this has dire effects on wildlife and may also add to shore erosion. Some people are all too often concerned only with their leisure and fun activities because they have not been educated about the impact of their behaviors on wildlife. Others are not good stewards due to apathy. It is the responsibility of government to protect our natural resources over the desires of beach goers and the businesses that complain of income loss if beach access is limited. Humans are adaptable, animals will simply die if they haven't got a home to use. This is why this issue is so important.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3958    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.06,2010 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 the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.  
 There are many people who can enjoy the seashore besides those with ORVs. ORV users can learn to live with access just a bit more brief. None of us should be selfish in our demands for our way or no way.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3959    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.06,2010 14:59:19  
**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:** 3960    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.06,2010 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.  
 We need to recover the birds and sea turtles on the Seashore. That should be the overall priority. Once they are gone, they are gone. Of the alternatives presented, D is the best. More beaches should be dedicated to families, pedestrians and wildlife, and less to ORVs. I would be proud to stand behind this plan, because it would definitely have a positive effect on wildlife, even if it meant restriction in access, I would know it was for an important reason and would support it 100%.  
 This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
 The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
 \*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
 \* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
 \* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3961    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I usually visit the Cape Hatteras National Seashore 3 times a year. I like to walk on the beach, swim or just sit on the beach but I cannot fully enjoy myself because I must be constantly alert for people driving on the beach. I have no problem with people bringing their vehicles to the beach to fish but I think that there should be an equal amount of beach that is for pedestrian use only. 30 years ago when I first visited the National Seashore there were only a few people who had vehicles that could drive on the beach. Now everyone has a 4 wheel drive and driving on the beach is not just for fishing but for cruising. This is a fragile ecosystem and we must protect it.  
Of the 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 ask that any plan that is approved will do the following:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families 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. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.?

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3962    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 15:04:37  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am longtime surffisherman and been going to the Cape Hatteras area for fifteen years. The ability to use a vehicle on the beach is an incredible experience for me and my family. To take that away would be a crime and a tragedy for a lot of people. We as fishermen respect and love the ocean. We do not take this for granted and see this opportunity as a gift! A gift that we cherish everytime we are there! We are able to forget about reality and enjoy life with our family and friends! So please lets do the right thing!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3963    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** O'Neal, Joan A  
**Received:** May,06,2010 15:15:25  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I agree with some of the plan and disagree with other parts. I believe everyone should try and help the wild life no matter what it is. however I do not agree with the NPS DEIS. There are a lot of room for improvement. A single nest does not need 1,000m. All other places in the US uses 200m to 300m. why does the few that nest here need so much.  
I have lived on Hatteras Island all my life and have never seen a dead bird from trucks or people using the beach. It is a fact that less than 3% of harm to birds come from humans. The facts prove that other means should be the concern of the Park Service and other concerned persons. The same is true for turtles. I could tell you how we used to eat the birds and turtles here on Hatteras Island. They did not become endangered then and are still here today. I believe corridors should be all the way on the beach for ORV and Pedestrian and their dogs on lease.  
If our beach is closed, WE WILL lose our homes and business and Dare County will lose Millions of dollars in taxes (sales & private).

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3964    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Fries, John E  
**Received:** May,06,2010 15:16:34  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I can understand the difficulty you are having in trying to balance public uses of the beach (vehicle, walking, swimming, boarding, etc.) with the protection of wild life. As a naturalist, a fisherman and an ocean front home owner in Rodanthe, I am aware of the wildlife issues and the vehicle traffic on the beach in front of my home. It's mildly annoying at times but no damage is done.  
Fishermen have their rights too. Once on the beach by vehicle, they are doing no harm other than to make ruts in the sand that the ocean washes over on the next tide.  
The "beach combers" have rights too. They are absolutely no problem other than when they leave trash behind. But if you are realistic, you should be aware of how much the walkers really care about the beaches. The signs of public use are so much less on Hatteras Island than in most other areas along the ocean front.  
Turtles and nesting birds are a problem at certain times of the year only. This includes endangered species as well as all others.  
The changes you are proposing go beyond what is necessary! If you follow through with the changes you are proposing do you have the man power to be able to enforce the new laws? I don't think so. With the present limited man power, beach patrols can barely keep up with the problems that exist under the present laws.  
I really believe it is necessary to continue to enforce the laws that are presently in effect. Massive changes that would affect vacationers use of the area is wrong.  
I sincerely believe there is a common ground. The solution is: 1) Limit the use of vehicles and pedestrian traffic to safe areas ONLY during the problem times mentioned above 2) Continue to allow vehicle access to the beach only at designated locations 3) Hire additional enforcement officers for patrol during the limited beach access times 4) Make the fines for breaking the law severe enough to help bring a stop to the problem 5) Do not limit public access to the beach except at endangered times and then only in specified areas.  
Yes, this is the National Sea Shore but the people are the nation! Do not take our rights away! Find a balance that works! Do not be heavily influenced by overzealous nature lovers OR by fisnerman!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3965    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Ellington, Linda M  
**Received:** May,06,2010 15:21:13  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I strongly DISAGREE with the harshness of the size of the buffers and the restrictive access of the proposed new management plan.

In my personal opinion, the punitive degree of these closures will not engender empathy for preservation but will instead breed rebellion. Most of us agree (except for your specified 3%) that preservation is an important issue. Would it not be easier, more agreeable and less expensive to educate than to attempt to enforce unfair rulings on angry residents and tourists?

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3966    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** May,06,2010 15:27:50  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Hatteras and Ocracoke Islands were given to the US citizens for the establishment of a perpetual national park for the utilization by the citizens/quests of the USA. The inhabitants of these islands have since then relied on beach access and the associated tourism business as a major source of its economy. With the possibility of denying beach access pending, these economies will suffer enormously. Businesses are already closing, while others are suffering in the diminishing business.  
Individuals who have bought real estate on these islands as investments and for personal enjoyment are being greatly affected. Already, the value of my properties have dropped over 15% since the beach closures were initiated. Families wishing to enjoy a day on the beach can't gain access, and sport fishermen have stopped coming. This ongoing loss in real estate value will significantly effect the tax revenues of Dare County, thus decreasing its ability to sustain vital services and infrastructure.  
There has already been sufficient acreage set aside to foster and sustain the turtle, plover, tern and other wildlife populations. Restricting neighboring land for use by the populous will not enhance the migratory habits of this wildlife.  
To view the beach expanse from the shores of the Outer Banks is an incomparable experience anywhere in the country. To deny that possibility to our citizens is in total disregard to the initial intent of the creation of the greatest National Seashore Park ever created by our wise and far sighted government. We can not allow the interference of political action groups to end this inalienable right.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3967    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 15:28:04  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I live a very long way from Cape Hatteras and don't get over there very often. But when I do, it is to see the birds and other wildlife. The Audubon Society thinks Plan D in the best. I'm not sure about that, but whatever plan you choose, it should definitely protect the sea turtles, the piping plovers and other beach nesting birds.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3968    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 15:29:20  
**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:** 3969    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Moffatt, Polly B  
**Received:** May,06,2010 15:34:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I support alternative A or B. Alternative D or F ensures a slow death to the residents of Hatteras Island. I see government officials wringing their hands as they worry about the oil spill coming ashore on barrier islands in the Gulf of Mexico and the impact on the residents of the area and the very real fact that their lives will be changed forever. In the case of Hatteras Island, government officials are the threat to a way of life, instead of an oil spill. It's amazing that the "recreational" portion of the official name for Cape Hatteras National Recreational Seashore has conveniently been dropped. It's also amazing that the federal government can so easily withdraw their pledge when they took over private property from property owners on the Outer Banks to create this recreational seashore. It guess the government's word is not as good as it once was. Why is Pea Island not being included for the purposes of this review and why are scientists using faulty science to support the claims of environmentalists and why is the Park Service accepting this! Where are the wildlife supporters for native wildlife - how can you justify capturing and killing native wildlife to protect birds, that for the most part aren't even threatened. The logic in this whole process is so convoluted it defies any explanation. If your intent is to move all habitants of Hatteras Island off the island and make it a wildlife refuge, then just say so and begin action in that area. This slow death process that we're living through is unbearable.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3970    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Peele, Charles E  
**Received:** May,06,2010 15:35:25  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I live squarely in the middle of the Cape Hatteras Seashore. I enjoy it 365 days per year. I was a Park Service volunteer in 2007-2009 working as a trapper to reduce raccoon, opossum, feral cats, otter, mink, and nutria. I have since donated my traps and equipment to the NPS.  
The removal of any species to accommodate a chosen few is not a workable form of natural selection. I enjoy birds and turtles and see both from my back door most any warm day. Many species are cyclical in numbers. We used to have no pelicans, now they stay here year around and starve in the winter.

Double breasted commerants were rarely seen 40 years ago, and now they are in abundance. This island once sported a viable population of beautiful ringneck pheasants. They reproduced nowhere else in NC. They were not natural, but I regret their removal by the NPS. I cannot imagine how they harmed our habitat. Cotton tail rabbits once numbered in the tens of thousands on Bodie Island, now they are scarce because the red and grey fox prey on them. The rabbits will recover once the fox starve out. We occasionally see bald eagles. Osprey pairs nest just behind my house and I observe them feeding their young each year. Nature is adaptable and does very well on its own without fences.

The Pamlico sound is full of loggerhead turtles right now. They destroy crab pots belonging to commercial fishermen. We often catch them in gill nets during our flounder season, yet turtle numbers are surely increasing in the sound and flounder numbers are down. Go figure.

If I've ever seen a piping plover, I didn't recognise it. I don't go looking for them and I don't drive my truck through their nesting areas. Terns have very successful rookeries on dredge spoil islands and I'm told they nest on the flat roof of our Food Lion supermarket. Those terns have no predators because they have learned to adapt. They nest where people, foxes, and raccoons, do not go. They even nest on one end of the dredge island while larger birds raise their young on the other end. They exist in harmony.

Wild birds and creatures feed on each other. The fish in the ocean feed on each other as well as on young turtles. Gulls by the millions are natural predators of weak, injured, and opportunistic prey. The Glaucous gull eats wild ducks and other gulls and attacks them on the water and in mid air. I'm certain they eat shore birds also. Snakes and alligators eat mammals, amphibians, and birds ever year. This is how it should be in a natural world. Population cycles are natural. Extention is natural. It has occured since life began, and always will. Man is not the only culprit. A few birds and turtles in the grand design of the natural world, will not tip the scale either way. And they should not. Feral cats are a genuine concern and should be reduced significantly.

I am a 27 year veterel of the Coast Guard Reserve. I served on this island and I feel I have helped this community, but it is not my right to restrict the access of others to enjoy that which was purchased with our tax money and given back to all of us, rather than to a special few.

I recommend no total closures of public beach stretches. Closing selected dunes and flats is acceptable. Fencing off or relocating turtle eggs is a great benefit and should be continued. Denying vast oceanfront areas to the public and landowners is not a workable solution for our wildlife or our economy. It is hard to tell which is more fragile, and both will benefit by letting natural selection take its own course. There are no winners and losers in the natural world. We learn to adapt, we die, or we move on.

Let's focus on green living methods and energy conservation. Polution is the enemy of our lives at the coast. Our sounds and estuaries need help. The piping plover matters very little to our planet. It thrives very well in other locations that are more hospitable to its needs. The same can be said for sea turtles. Protection is a great idea but not isolation at public expense. The real culprits do not live on the portions of Hatteras Island that is open to the public, nor has beach fishing eliminated or threatened any species. The common house cat is a far greater threat.

Surely those in our government who wish to regulate us have bigger fish to fry. Put a toll booth on each end of the National Seashore. That will help fund many needed improvements on the island. Fencing out people is not a solution.

**Correspondence ID:** 3971    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Swanson, David T  
**Received:** May,06,2010 15:45:23  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am in favor of reducing the ability for private vehicles to drive on the beach of the Outer Banks. There are so few places where vehicles are not allowed and many other sections of the beach are left open for vehicles. The marine/aquatic life needs certain areas that can remain unspoiled and undisturbed. No vehicles on certain parts of the Outer Banks! Thanks!

**Correspondence ID:** 3972    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 15:52:09  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** With empathy; Kiteboarders using the Squamish Spit facility face LITTLE challenges environmentally, our facility boarder lines a wilderness estuary. If our Kite beach was shut down due to environmental concerns then it would be unjustly so. Our affect on the local wildlife has been such that blue herrons have increased in number and Grey whales have been visiting the area for the first time in over 20 years. More kiteboarders and nature enthusiasts come every year. People enjoy the local wildlife and sporting facility without harming the estuary life in a way that they did not before. If this was taken away from the community in Squamish, like it has been suggested for Hatteras, it would be very unjust. I do not agree that closing extensive amounts of beach to users who are not harming the environment in the Hatteras area is not right. ex:kickers using clean wind juxtaposed to boaters dumping toxic fuels. We adhear to a policy: If you bring itin(garbage)you bring it out. Why can't Hatteras?

**Correspondence ID:** 3973    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 15:59:29  
**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.

The Outer Banks of North Carolina have been my wife's and my particular "haunt" for the past 55 years, so I write with considerable knowledge and perspective. In our early years, ORV driving, while traveling between Nags Head and Hatteras, and no road existed, was an accepted practice. As the beaches became crowded with tourists and over-developed, the ocean-front began to be overrun with vehicles, until, in recent years the beaches have looked like Interstate Highways, with drivers fighting for ocean-front parking during surf fishing season, particularly around Cape Point. It has been a nightmare, for the animals (except the gulls, of course, who are fed with bait and garbage) as well as for nature-oriented humans.

Now, when we go down to the Outer Banks, we say our deepest thanks to the early visionaries who created the National Seashore, which provides oases of some open seashore, as limited as it is. The National Park Service must stand fast to protect what small amount of habitat for threatened or endangered wildlife which still exists on the Banks.

Please stand fast and protect your rights to protect nature. Thank you.

**Correspondence ID:** 3974    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Fort, Eddie A  
**Received:** May,06,2010 16:15:57  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Thank you for the opportunity.

1. I Strongly disagree with the extensive boundaries set for the Piping Plover, American Oystercatcher and other species of up to 1000 M. Now where else in this country is that the case for species NOT on the Endangered Species List.(p 121 - 127) The expanded buffers have not been proven to increase chick survivability. The natural extreme conditions have proven to be the largest factor in chick mortality.
2. I strongly disagree with the permanent exclusion of the areas to the West of Ramp 55 commonly known as the Inlet. (p. 99 - 107).I could not find and justification for this extreme measure as that area is under constant flux due to the wind and tidal conditions the survivability of any species in that area is subject to the environmental conditions NOT due to any human encounters. The NPS has not presented any evidence to support their position.
3. I feel that adopting Alternative "F" would result in an extremely restrictive area and not be in the best interest of all the users of the recreation area. Specifically the Executive Order 11644 was to "...establish policies and provide for procedures that will ensure that the use of off-road vehicles on public lands will be controlled and directed so as to protect the resources of those lands, to promote the safety of all users of those lands and to minimize

conflicts among the various uses of those lands". It was not intended to prevent the access of the lands by the American people. It is imperative that ORV use be recognized for exactly what it is: A historical means of access to an area especially attractive for recreational opportunities. The use of an ORV is not considered a recreational activity in this Recreational Area. 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. The vast stretches of undeveloped shoreline between villages are a major attraction for visitors. Closing as little as 20% of the 68 miles of shoreline forces more people into smaller areas, increasing the potential for user conflict and diminishing the attractiveness for visitors. It is unreasonable to expect, or attempt to provide, a beach wilderness experience with over two million annual visitors on only 68 miles of shoreline.

In short adoption of Alternative "F" would result in the only National Recreation area in the United States that is effectively unavailable to the American public and I urge in the strongest possible terms to adopt Alternative "A" and keep the environment as it has been for the past 100 years. Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3975    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Streinz, Donald F  
**Received:** May,03,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** Donald F. Streinz 346 Town Hill Road New Hartford, CT 06057  
 April 30, 2010  
 Mr. Mike Murray, Superintendent Cape Hatteras National Seashore 1401 National Park Drive Manteo, NC 27954  
 Subject: National Park Service Proposed Rules for Hatteras Island Beach Access

Dear Sir,

I and my family have owned a home at 54107 Sandpiper Drive, Frisco, NC for 20+ years. We and our guests have enjoyed the Park and access to the beach for a variety of recreational purposes, including hiking, swimming, fishing, ORV exploring etc. I have recently become aware of the Park Service's draft ORV management plan and have some concerns. I will attempt to express them briefly below.

Issues:

1. NPS states up front (p.1) that because the Pea Island NWR is not administered by NPS, it cannot direct its visitor use. It is true that the Pea Island NWR is managed by a different agency, but an agency of the same Government. Responsible management of Hatteras Island's sea shore requires that the agencies communicate and that NPS as originator of this document direct usage of areas under its jurisdiction in a manner that explicitly considers controls presently in place at Pea Island. 2. NPS proposes shorter off-season ORV access for south-facing villages than for the remainder of HI. The rationale for this difference is not apparent. Seasonal visitor usage statistics are similar for both south facing and east facing villages. Beach usage is therefore also similar. Increased restriction for the south facing villages is unfairly burdensome. 3. NPS buffer zones around breeding nests and unfledged birds are excessive by my experience. On northern coastal beaches where I frequent, Piping Plover (which are native to the area) buffer zones are very much smaller, often less than 10 meters. By my observations, this has no apparent effect on the birds. They nest and grow in full harmony with the human activities around them. 4. NPS buffer zones for birds do not seem to include corridors through them for human (ORV) passage. If large buffers must be employed, then passages need to be incorporated and be moved, if necessary, as chicks relocate for food. 5. NPS has a legal and moral responsibility to protect and preserve the traditional cultural importance of the Outer Banks surf zone. At the establishment of the HI National Seashore, the NPS was charged with the responsibility to preserve traditional cultural access and activities (commercial and recreational fishing, off-road access, etc.) of the communities affected. In contrast, the document places extreme restrictions on human interference with wildlife when documented nest failure assessments have shown that human interference is the least significant impact, by an order of magnitude. 6. Prohibition of pets "during bird breeding season" (p.136) is not justified. A simple requirement that pets be positively controlled is justified and adequate. Pets should not be allowed on the beach unless leashed with 6 foot maximum leads. Leashed access should be permitted year-round.

Thank you for the opportunity to express some of my concerns regarding this document.

Sincerely, Donald F. Streinz

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3976    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Yates, Jeffrey  
**Received:** May,06,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Mr. Murray,

It has been brought to the attention of the kiteboarding community that a variety of plans are being considered in response to proposed environmental and ecological concerns. The Outer Banks of North Carolina is a sanctuary for many beach goers, sports enthusiasts, wildlife observers and most importantly, the natural environment. We, as a community, feel that it is important for the environment to be protected and thus understand certain steps may be 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 away 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 wildlife.

We strongly feel that the Historical, Cultural, and Economic ramifications of the proposed plans have not been adequately addressed by the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) as is required.

Should the environmental changes impact our communities sport (as it would in Plans D, E, & F) we would be forced to reconsider our frequent and environmentally friendly utilization of the Outer Banks. Other user groups such as surfers, fishermen, beachcombers, and virtually all other forms of tourism will also be discouraged from visiting Cape Hatteras if beach closures are greatly expanded. This will have a severely negative impact on the local economy and way of life that the residents of Hatteras Island have enjoyed for many generations. It will also take away something that is important to the lives of thousands of people throughout the United States and around the world.

If people, and especially children, can not experience the environment how are they going to learn to help you protect the environment?

Kind Regards,  
 Jeff Yates

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3977    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 16:29:30  
**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:** 3978    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 16:29:30  
**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:** 3979    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 16:29:30  
**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:** 3980    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 16:29:30  
**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:** 3981    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 16:29:36  
**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:** 3982    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 16:29:36  
**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:** 3983    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 16:29:36  
**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:** 3984    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 16:29:36  
**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:** 3985    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 16:29:36  
**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:** 3986    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Taft, Ed  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** Mike Murray, Superintendent Cape Hatteras National Seashore 1401 National Park Drive Manteo, NC 27954  
4/26/10  
Please do NOT sanction the state and federal closure of the ORV beach access on Hatteras and Ocracoke Islands.  
As a member of the National Wildlife Association, I support protecting wildlife habitat, however, I strongly feel that we can cooperate with sound programs for beach enjoyment without complete access closure.  
Ed Taft

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3987    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 16:29:36  
**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:** 3988    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 16:29:42  
**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:** 3989    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 16:29:42  
**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:** 3990    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 16:29:42  
**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:** 3991    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 16:29:42  
**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:** 3992    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 16:29:43  
**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:** 3993    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 16:29:43  
**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:** 3994    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 16:29:43  
**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:** 3995    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 16:29:43  
**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:** 3996    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 16:29:49  
**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:** 3997    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 16:29:49  
**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:** 3998    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 16:29:49  
**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:** 3999    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 16:29:50  
**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:** 4000    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 16:29:50  
**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.

---