

**Correspondence ID:** 4001    **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.  
Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4002    **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:** 4003    **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:** 4004    **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:** 4005    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 16:29:56  
**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:** 4006    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 16:30:02  
**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:** 4007    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 16:30:02  
**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:** 4008    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 16:30:02  
**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:** 4009    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 16:30:09  
**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:** 4010    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 16:30:09  
**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:** 4011    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 16:30:09  
**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:** 4012    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 16:30:11  
**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:** 4013    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 16:30:11  
**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:** 4014    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 16:30:12  
**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:** 4015    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 16:30:12  
**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:** 4016    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 16:30:16  
**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:** 4017    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 16:30:16  
**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:** 4018    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 16:30:16  
**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:** 4019    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 16:30:16  
**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:** 4020    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 16:30:16  
**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:** 4021    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 16:30:23  
**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:** 4022    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 16:30:25  
**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:** 4023    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 16:30:25  
**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:** 4024    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 16:30:25  
**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:** 4025    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 16:30:25  
**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:** 4026    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 16:30:29  
**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:** 4027    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 16:30:29  
**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:** 4028    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 16:30:29  
**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:** 4029    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 16:30:30  
**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.  
This bird is beautiful. Please give it a safe home!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4030    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 16:30:30  
**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:** 4031    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 16:30:30  
**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:** 4032    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 16:30:38

**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:** 4033    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 16:30:47

**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:** 4034    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 16:30:47

**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:** 4035    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 16:30:47

**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:** 4036    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 16:30:54

**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:** 4037    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 16:30:54

**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:** 4038    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 16:30:54  
**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:** 4039    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 16:30:54  
**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:** 4040    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 16:30:54  
**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:** 4041    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 16:30:54  
**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:** 4042    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 16:30:54  
**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:** 4043    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 16:30:54  
**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:** 4044    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 16:30:54

**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:** 4045    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 16:30:59

**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:** 4046    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 16:30:59

**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:** 4047    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 16:30:59

**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:** 4048    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 16:30:59

**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:** 4049    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 16:31:00

**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're playing with fire here !! When will the degradation stop? When it's beyond mankind's control? This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

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

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



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

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

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

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

**Correspondence ID:** 4050    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 16:31:00

**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:** 4051    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 16:31:00

**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:** 4052    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 16:31:07

**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 very important to me.

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Correspondence ID:** 4053    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 16:31:07

**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:** 4054    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 16:31:08

**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:** 4055    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 16:31:08

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

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

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this

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

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

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

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4056    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 16:31:14  
**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:** 4057    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 16:31:14  
**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:** 4058    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 16:31:14  
**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:** 4059    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 16:31:14

**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:** 4060    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 16:31:14

**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:** 4061    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 16:31:21

**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:** 4062    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 16:31:21  
**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:** 4063    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 16:31:21  
**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:** 4064    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 16:31:21  
**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:** 4065    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 16:31:21  
**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:** 4066    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 16:31:21  
**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:** 4067    **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 protect the rare wildlife at Cape Hatteras National Seashore. They cannot speak for themselves, and all too often just get run over (no pun intended) by humans with whom they so generously share this Earth -- but do not receive the same courtesy in return. They need us to protect their habitat.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only

16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

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

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4068    **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, please consider what is written below. This is very important, not only to me, but to my whole family and generations to come. The birds and turtles of Cape Hatteras are an inspiration and a treasure to be protected. Please take a stand on this, don't back down, represent your community's voice on this.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4069    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 16:31:28  
**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:** 4070    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 16:31:28  
**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:** 4071    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 16:31:28  
**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:** 4072    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 16:31:28  
**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:** 4073    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 16:31:28  
**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:** 4074    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 16:31:28  
**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:** 4075    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 16:31:28  
**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:** 4076    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 16:31:28  
**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:** 4077    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 16:31:36  
**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:** 4078    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 16:31:36  
**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:** 4079    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 16:31:36  
**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. ORV use has no place in public lands when such use degrades the habitat for the fragile natural flora and fauna. ORV's have many places to operate; they should not be allowed to destroy a National Park or, indeed, any precious habitat.

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

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

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

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4080    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 16:31:36

**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:** 4081    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 16:31:36

**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:** 4082    **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.

Speaking as one who stays at Cape Hatteras National Seashore, and spends money at local rental cottages, local restaurants, local bait and tackle shops (even though they have giant anti-Audubon banners), local recreational rental establishments, as well as National Park Service facilities, I believe this alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

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

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

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

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

**Correspondence ID:** 4083    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 16:31:36  
**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:** 4084    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 16:31:36  
**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:** 4085    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 16:31:43  
**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:** 4086    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 16:31:43

**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:** 4087    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 16:31:43

**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.

I personally feel that the presence of ORV on beaches is plain stupid. ORVs should be severely limited. We have a similar problem in Florida. Please make Cape Hatteras NS a safe haven for nesting birds, sea turtles, and people on foot.

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Correspondence ID:** 4088    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 16:31:43

**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

PLEASE===PLEASE===PLEASE

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4089    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 16:31:43

**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:** 4090    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 16:31:43

**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:** 4091    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 16:31:49

**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:** 4092    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 16:31:49

**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:** 4093    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 16:31:49

**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:** 4094    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 16:31:49

**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:** 4095    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 16:31:49

**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:** 4096    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 16:31:49

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

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

I wanted to write on behalf of the animals that rely on the Cape Hatteras Sea Shore for their continued existence. This area has been home to sea turtles and other marine creatures plus a vital stopping point for migrating shorebirds and a nesting area for many other birds. Their homes should not be run over by ORVs, nor should they be terrorized by these vehicles.

In addition, anything that would result in people getting out of their vehicles and walking along the sea shore seems like a good thing. We are in an oil crisis and more judicious use of this resource should be encouraged.

These bans have taken place on other beaches, often at first with resistance, but eventually people come to appreciate the beaches for multiple reasons, in solitude and with family and friends.

We have to take a stand for wildlife and wild areas.

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

**Correspondence ID:** 4097    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 16:31:49

**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:** 4098    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 16:31:49  
**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:** 4099    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 16:31:58  
**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:** 4100    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 16:31:58  
**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:** 4101    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 16:31:58  
**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:** 4102    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 16:31:58  
**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:** 4103    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 16:32:06  
**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:** 4104    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 16:32:06  
**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:** 4105    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 16:32:06  
**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:** 4106    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 16:32:06  
**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:** 4107    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 16:32:06  
**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:** 4108    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 16:32:06  
**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:** 4109    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 16:32:06  
**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:** 4110    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 16:32:06  
**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:** 4111    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 16:32:12  
**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:** 4112    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 16:32:12  
**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:** 4113    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 16:32:12  
**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:** 4114    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 16:32:12  
**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:** 4115    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 16:32:12  
**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.  
I believe this alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at

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

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

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

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

**Correspondence ID:** 4116    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 16:32:12  
**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:** 4117    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 16:32:12  
**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.  
Please continue to do all you can to protect and preserve our precious wild animals. Please!  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 4118    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 16:32:12  
**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:** 4119    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 16:32:19  
**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:** 4120    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 16:32:19  
**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:** 4121    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 16:32:19  
**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:** 4122    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 16:32:19

**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:** 4123    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 16:32:19

**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:** 4124    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 16:32:19

**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:** 4125    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 16:32:24  
**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:** 4126    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 16:32:24  
**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:** 4127    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 16:32:24  
**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:** 4128    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 16:32:24

**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:** 4129    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 16:32:27

**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:** 4130    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 16:32:31

**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:** 4131    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 16:32:31  
**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:** 4132    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 16:32:37  
**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:** 4133    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 16:32:37  
**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:** 4134    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 16:32:37  
**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.  
Hello,  
Please help save some of our history!  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 4135    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 16:32:37  
**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:** 4136    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 16:32:37  
**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:** 4137    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 16:32:44

**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:** 4138    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 16:32:44

**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:** 4139    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 16:32:45

**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:** 4140    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 16:32:45

**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:** 4141    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 16:32:45

**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:** 4142    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 16:32:45

**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:** 4143    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 16:32:50

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Correspondence ID:** 4144    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 16:32:50

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Correspondence ID:** 4145    **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, 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, especially wildlife who are impacted by these vehicles. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half if not more of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife would have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering 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:** 4146    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 16:32:50

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Correspondence ID:** 4147    **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 do not believe that beaches such as this, in sensitive areas, should even be open to ORVs. Shouldn't there be places in the world where we are not subjected to vehicles? Where we and the wildlife can have some peace? I say ban them from beaches period! But since I know that won't happen...

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Correspondence ID:** 4148    **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 less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following considerations should be considered as an alternative to Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors.

\* Put Natural Resources First.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery.

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

**Correspondence ID:** 4149    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 16:32:57  
**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:** 4150    **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 vehicles should be kept to specific non-critical areas. The majority of off road drivers do not take care to see what they might be disturbing. And even if they are the noise and interruption of pristine habitat is detrimental to wildlife. This isn't just a planet of humans trying to survive, it's a planet of all living things. No species owns it.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 4151    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 16:32:57  
**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:** 4152    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 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:** 4153    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 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:** 4154    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 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:** 4155    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.06.2010 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:** 4156    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.06.2010 16:33:10  
**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:** 4157    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.06.2010 16:33:10  
**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:** 4158    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 16:33:10

**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:** 4159    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 16:33:10

**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:** 4160    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 16:33:10

**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:** 4161    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.06.2010 16:33:10  
**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:** 4162    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.06.2010 16:33:16  
**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:** 4163    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.06.2010 16:33:16  
**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:** 4164    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 16:33:16  
**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:** 4165    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 16:33:16  
**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:** 4166    **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 more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

My wife and I have appreciated our visits to Cape Hatteras in the past for the wildlife we have liked to think are protected there. In light of the Gulf Coast events and the obvious selfish disregard for wildlife humans who gambled with safety features for oil drilling, I should hope that you all are choosing to protect your wildlife from human impact.

**Correspondence ID:** 4167    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 16:33:16

**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:** 4168    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 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.

ORVs are noisy and spew pollutants into the environment and provide no benefit to those of us looking to find solitude in the beauty of nature. There are more of us in this nation than there are ORV users and we need to be considered equally in these plans.

**Correspondence ID:** 4169    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 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:** 4170    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 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:** 4171    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 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:** 4172    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 16:33:27  
**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:** 4173    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 16:33:27  
**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:** 4174    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 16:33:28  
**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:** 4175    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 16:33:28  
**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

0009959

16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

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

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4176    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 16:33:28  
**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:** 4177    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 16:40:02  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** It appears to me that the proposed alternative starts with the Consent Decree as a reference point. I do not believe that the CD should be used as a starting point, rather the Interim Plan, as it went through the proper qualification process. Using the Consent Decree is equal to letting a judge rule how the area will be managed, a responsibility for which they would not be qualified.  
There has been no consideration for historical usage in the DEIS. This consideration is required by Federal law. The total ban on night driving is ludicrous and limits how many people have historically used the area to surf fish at night.  
The closures for the spits on both sides of Hatteras Inlet and the area between Ramp 27 and Ramp 30 are unneeded and not based on science. Do not fence off areas of a Recreation Area created by Congress and make it a Wildlife Preserve. We have a preserve on Hatteras Island; it is called Pea Island and there is no driving and the PIPL still don't show up in great numbers.  
Move the turtle nests in jeopardy of being washed away, stop closing the beach for species that are not Federally listed as Endangered (AMOU), stop killing the predators, and clear the brush around the pond. Return the area to what it was before so many well-intentioned programs altered nature to the point that the birds moved out to the beaches.  
Please allow the people who actually visit CAHA to have a voice in how the area is managed as much as possible. Outside groups that have no investment in the area and are only out to promote themselves should have little to no voice in this process. - On an unrelated note, why do the dumpsters at the ramps have to be painted bright orange? They are an eyesore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4178    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 16:58:17  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Just a quick comment.  
I'm an avid kite surfer/ windsurfer, who appreciates the need to protect wildlife along the shores of Lakes and Oceans..  
The Outer Banks, Cape Hatteras and other areas in question, reap the rewards of all the dollars funneled into the area from water sport enthusiast like myself... There has to be a way to keep all user of the shore line relatively happy while ensuring the safety and health of wildlife within these areas...  
I have no problem with the idea of keeping vehicular traffic off these areas, and propose the construction of more small, low impact ,parking areas on the inland side of the sand dunes... The money that tourism / water sports has brought to these areas throughout the years has to be of great importance to all in the area... If you ban access to these beaches during the prime months of the season, we will not come back, and will take our money elsewhere, if need be...  
Thank-you for your time.  
Respectfully, Tony Dobson...

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4179    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 17:02:06  
**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:** 4180    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 17:02:06  
**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:** 4181    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 17:02:06  
**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:** 4182    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 17:02:07  
**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:** 4183    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 17:03:11  
**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:** 4184    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 17:03:11  
**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:** 4185    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Hoag, Eric  
**Received:** May,03,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:**

Dear Mr. Murray:

I disagree with the sizes of enclosures in table 11, page 127. Based on my experience as a birder and fisherman on the Outer Banks and, previously, in CT, RI, and Mass., these enclosures are a maximum whose perimeters might be approached toward the end of a breeding cycle. Where an enclosure blocks access to a location on the water which is highly desirable for human activities there should be an access corridor.

I agree with the concept of developing an educational program that would increase peoples' understanding and appreciation of the natural community and dynamics of the Outer Banks. Such a program should be offered to everybody even if it is mandatory for ORVs and/or pedestrians on the beaches. I disagree with the need for "floating" enclosures for non-breeding birds (page 81, paragraph 4). Each of the proposed areas in which such an enclosure will occur is proximate to areas already closed to humans, not to mention the likely establishment of additional SMA, associated with nesting activities. I disagree with abandoning turtle nest relocation (pages 86-87) as an option for maintaining ORV access to an otherwise 'open' area. It is an option that could be used as it might be in the case of a likely inundation.

After reading the executive summary, my feeling of joy and privilege at being 'on the beach' ? whether in a vehicle or on foot ? became a feeling of trespass. I still feel a sense of stewardship and responsibility but it seems irrelevant and unwanted.

Though I'm not so hopeful that this process will soften the effects of some of the extreme attitudes that seem to be affecting the 'plan,' it is the process and this response is a sign of respect for the process. I heard many good comments and suggestions at the public hearing and hope this process can refocus the work of the Park Service toward the whole of its original mandate and prevent it from becoming primarily a policing agency whose task is controlling human access to the seashore ? especially the ORV users who, undeservedly, come off as outlaws in the DEIS.

Sincerely, (illegible first name) Hoge

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4186    **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 more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

These recommended plans are far more lenient than I consider necessary, but seem to provide a concession to meet the needs of the ORV drivers.

Having just returned from the Galapagos Islands, which have such strict guidelines - erring on the complete protection of all wildlife - I'm disappointed that we even have to have a discussion about this topic at all. It's sad how entitled the American public has become with regards to our vehicles and making sure we aren't inconvenienced by anything.

Please vote with the future in mind!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4187    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 17:06:46

**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:** 4188    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 17:07:11

**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:** 4189    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 17:07:11  
**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:** 4190    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 17:07:11  
**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:** 4191    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 17:11:41  
**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:** 4192    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 17:13:12  
**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:** 4193    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 17:13:12  
**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:** 4194    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 17:13:52  
**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:** 4195    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 17:14:16  
**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:** 4196    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 17:14:46  
**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:** 4197    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 17:14:46  
**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:** 4198    **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 would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife. The following should be considered in regard to the park's decision of its final plan:

- 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.
- 2) Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best 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. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are 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 of my comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4199    **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 more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4200    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 17:16:16  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to

provide greater pedestrian access.

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Correspondence ID:** 4201    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 17:16:46  
**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:** 4202    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 17:17:46  
**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:** 4203    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 17:17:46  
**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:** 4204    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 17:18:19

**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:** 4205    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Midgett, Lovie O'Neal

**Received:** Apr,29,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** Attn: Mike Murray, Superintendent Cape Hatteras National Seashore 1401 National Park Drive Manteo, NC 27945

Dear Mr. Murray and members of the National Park Service:

I grew up on Hatteras Island and have gone to the beach my whole life. I used to swim from north Rodanthe to the pier and jump off of it in my youth. I will be 89 in July, and I still go to the beach with my sister, my children, and my grandchildren.

The beach does not belong to the Park Service. If anyone should stay off of it, it should be the park service itself. We always welcomed visitors, and were glad to have all people, so you can imagine the rudeness of your trying to steal our beaches. When the park service first came to our island, they promised the natives that they wouldn't prohibit them from using the land as they wanted. We trusted you; you let us down. We were used to being able to take a man for his word back then, but promises have been broken.

As for the birds, I feed them daily. We know our birds better than you do; they've been on the beaches with us our whole lives.

I pray God's blessings upon you, and that you will seek His will. Please don't take what doesn't belong to you, or involve yourselves in taking more from us than has already been taken. We've sacrificed enough.

Thank you, Lovie O'Neal Midgett

**Correspondence ID:** 4206    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 17:20:16

**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:** 4207    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.06.2010 17:20:46  
**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:** 4208    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.06.2010 17:20:49  
**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:** 4209    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.06.2010 17:21:16  
**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:** 4210    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 17:21:22

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I disagree with the Plan to transform the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area into a wildlife sanctuary by restricting vehicular as well as pedestrian access to the beaches. Specifically, Alternative F is so unnecessarily restrictive that it cannot be rationally described as the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area Off-Road Vehicle management plan because it all but eliminates Off-road vehicles as well as pedestrians. This plan will effectively eliminate a National Seashore Recreation Area and replace it with a wildlife refuge, without giving any weight to the cultural and economic consequences of this action. Of the 800 plus pages, only two paragraphs, are devoted to this aspect of the plans impact, not to mention the severe economic hardships that it will cause. As a homeowner in AVON, NC, I have already seen a significant drop, (almost 50 percent), in rentals for my home compared to this time two years ago before the restrictions on beach access were imposed. In addition, the plan does not give adequate consideration to the impact on the livelihood on the full-time inhabitants of the island as well. I have spoken to many individuals who previously vacationed on the outer banks, but have since decided it isn't worth the time or effort to make the trip any longer since there isn't any difference between Ocean City, MD, or Virginia Beach and the outer banks if they cannot enjoy the unique experience of traveling on the beaches to enjoy nature and the beauty of the Cape Hatteras Point.

My family and I have enjoyed the wonder and the beauty of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area since the early 80's. My children have grown up there and have many wonderful memories of the Point, its wildlife and freedom to explore it. Alternative F's overly restrictive guidelines will effectively deny future generations this experience, and destroy the way of life for all of the inhabitants of the island.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4211    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 17:21:46

**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:** 4212    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 17:21:49

**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:** 4213    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 17:24:22  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4214    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 17:27:19  
**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:** 4215    **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 only fair to regulate the use of motorized vehicles on Cape Hatteras, an area preserved for its ecological value. There must be other less sensitive areas where ORVs can make noise and dump exhaust to their hearts' content. Why do they choose an area where their enjoyment may permanently damage the very wildlife that attracts visitors in the first 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. Don't forget that the Seashore is the only home these creatures have. We whose homes are not endangered need to respect that.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4216    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 17:28:46  
**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:** 4217    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 17:28:49  
**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:** 4218    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 17:29:17  
**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:** 4219    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 17:29:46  
**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:** 4220    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 17:30:17  
**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:** 4221    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 17:30:47  
**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:** 4222    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 17:30:47  
**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:** 4223    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 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.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4224    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 17:37:46  
**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:** 4225    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 17:38:16  
**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:** 4226    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 17:38:46  
**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:** 4227    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 17:40:17  
**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:** 4228    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 17:41:47  
**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:** 4229    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:01:04  
**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 remember to support Alternative D to protect Cape Hatteras.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.  
PLEASE SAVE THIS SPECIAL PLACE!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4230    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:01:05  
**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:** 4231    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:01:05  
**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:** 4232    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:01:07  
**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:** 4233    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:01:07  
**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:** 4234    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:01:07  
**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:** 4235    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:01:11  
**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:** 4236    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:01:21  
**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:** 4237    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:01:21  
**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:** 4238    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:01:21  
**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:** 4239    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 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.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan

are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4240    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 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.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4241    **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. The possible loss of piping plovers as a result of the oil spill on the Gulf of Mexico coast makes this even more important.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4242    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 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,



0009981

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

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4243    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:01:37

**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:** 4244    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:01:41

**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.

I have visited the Outer Banks before for the specific purposes of birding and other nature related pursuits. In that regard, I find the ORVs to be a major negative to both wildlife and my own enjoyment of the area.

Why should a small minority of people (the ORV users and the companies which make those machines) be given such a large area to run their machines when the result is that both wildlife and the majority of people, who prefer a more peaceful experience, have to suffer as a result? The ORV advocates who live on the Outer Banks seem to not care that, to a large degree, they depend upon visitors to the area such as myself who really don't like what has been going on there and visit less often as a result.

I don't ask that ORVs be totally banned. However, I feel that the environmentally preferred choice is clearly in order, to the benefit of both the majority of people and wildlife. I am also in favor of some increased pedestrian access

Thank you again for genuinely considering our comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4245    **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.

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4246    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:01:45

**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:** 4247    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:01:45  
**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:** 4248    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:01:51  
**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:** 4249    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:01:51  
**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.

In light of all the poisoned habitat in the Gulf of Mexico, please implement the above to preserve other habitat.

**Correspondence ID:** 4250    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 18:01:52

**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:** 4251    **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 once drove an ORV at several local Long Island beaches, but was always conscious of the wildlife that called the area home, or nesting regions, and took care to not disturb them. Sadly, too many other drivers do not take such care, and they are the problem.

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

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

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

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

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

**Correspondence ID:** 4252    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 18:01:52

**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:** 4253    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:01:52  
**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:** 4254    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:01:52  
**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:** 4255    **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. \* Put Natural Resources First. \* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery.

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

**Correspondence ID:** 4256    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 18:01:53

**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 protection of wildlife and natural resources in our national parks, I believe, must always come before recreational uses of any sort by anyone.

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

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

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

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

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

**Correspondence ID:** 4257    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 18:02:02

**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:** 4258    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 18:02:02

**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:** 4259    **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, to the coastal ecosystem and the Atlantic Flyway.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it mistakenly choose not to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide improved access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are bare 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:** 4260    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:02:02  
**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:** 4261    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:02:02  
**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:** 4262    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.06,2010 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.  
These protections are vital!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4263    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.06,2010 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:** 4264    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.06,2010 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:** 4265    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:02:12  
**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:** 4266    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:02:12  
**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:** 4267    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:02:14  
**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:** 4268    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:02:14  
**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:** 4269    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:02:14  
**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:** 4270    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:02:18  
**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:** 4271    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:02:18  
**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:** 4272    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:02:23  
**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.  
One final thought. In light of the recent oil spill in the Gulf of Mexico and the enormous loss there will be to wildlife and the coastal environment, we need to even more aggressively protect what we have left of our shoreline habitat.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4273    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:02:23  
**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:** 4274    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:02:23  
**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:** 4275    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:02:30  
**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:** 4276    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:02:30  
**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:** 4277    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:02:30  
**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. This is important to me. We've traveled to the Cape Hatteras area for birding and were especially thrilled to hear black rails calling.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4278    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:02:30  
**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:** 4279    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:02:30  
**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:** 4280    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:02:30  
**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:** 4281    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:02:36  
**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:** 4282    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:02:36  
**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:** 4283    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:02:36  
**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:** 4284    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:02:36  
**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:** 4285    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:02:36  
**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

0009995

are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4286    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:02:36  
**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:** 4287    **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. .  
\*Put Natural Resources First.  
\*Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4288    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:02:54  
**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:** 4289    **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.  
 Alternative D would provide two things which are important to me and to most other visitors to Cape Hatters: more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and less disturbance of wildlife.  
 Here are some key considerations in the park's formulation of its final plan, should it choose not to enact Alternative D:  
 \*Provide All Visitors With Equal Access. Under Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, more than half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
 \* Do Not Put the Wishes of a Few ORV Users Ahead of Natural Resources. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. Alternative F fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the Alternative F are inadequate minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
 \* Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery Must Be Established and Met. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4290    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:02:55  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
 This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
 The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
 \*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
 \* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
 \* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4291    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:02:55  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
 This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
 The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
 \*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
 \* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
 \* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4292    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:02:55



**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Correspondence ID:** 4293    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 18:02:55

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Correspondence ID:** 4294    **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.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

**Correspondence ID:** 4295    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 18:03:00

**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:** 4296    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:03:00  
**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:** 4297    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:03:00  
**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:** 4298    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:03:00  
**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:** 4299    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:03:01  
**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:** 4300    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 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:** 4301    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 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:** 4302    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 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:** 4303    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 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:** 4304    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 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:** 4305    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 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:** 4306    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 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. Thank You

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4307    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 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:** 4308    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:03:11  
**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:** 4309    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:03:12  
**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:** 4310    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:03:12  
**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:** 4311    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:03:12  
**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:** 4312    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:03:17  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4313    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:03:17  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
I am a business owner and resident of Ocracoke Island, NC. I support the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use and protect our wildlife. I believe that many of my colleagues have raised fear and emotions to the point that they are not thinking clearly. Except for possibly the shops that sell only to the fishermen crowd, economic impacts are due to the overall economy, not to the management of our beaches. I believe the management of our beaches have been carried out in a balanced way that supports the local tourism trade and helps to create a safe haven for our wildlife.  
It would be unwise and uncomfortable for me to go to one of the local comment meetings. I believe many other people might feel the same way. I have been threatened on blogs when I express my views. I have had two incidents of vandalism at my place of business which of course I can't substantiate but vandalism had never happened before.  
Just thought you would like to know that there may be those of us who do support what you are doing, we are just afraid to be vocal!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4314    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 18:03:17

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Correspondence ID:** 4315    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 18:03:17

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Correspondence ID:** 4316    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 18:03:23

**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:** 4317    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private



**Received:** May,06,2010 18:03:23  
**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:** 4318    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:03:23  
**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:** 4319    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:03:23  
**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.  
 There are plenty of other locations for ORV riders to enjoy their sport, while these special beaches are in need of firm protection. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are very important to me.  
 The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
 \*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
 \* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
 \* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4320    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 18:03:29

**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.

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Correspondence ID:** 4321    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 18:03:29

**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.

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Correspondence ID:** 4322    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 18:03:29

**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.

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Correspondence ID:** 4323    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 18:03:29

**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.

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Correspondence ID:** 4324    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 18:03:29

**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.

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Correspondence ID:** 4325    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 18:03:29

**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.

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Correspondence ID:** 4326    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 18:03:29

**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.

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Correspondence ID:** 4327    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 18:03:34

**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:** 4328    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 18:03:34

**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:** 4329    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 18:03:34  
**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:** 4330    **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:** 4331    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:03:34  
**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:** 4332    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:03:35  
**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:** 4333    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:03:40  
**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:** 4334    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:03:40  
**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:** 4335    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:03:40  
**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:** 4336    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 18:03:41

**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:** 4337    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 18:03:41

**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:** 4338    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 18:03:41

**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:** 4339    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 18:03:41

**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 should be considered important to EVERYONE.

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

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

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

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4340    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 18:03:41

**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:** 4341    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 18:03:46

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

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



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

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

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

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

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4342    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 18:03:46

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4343    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 18:03:46

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4344    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 18:03:46

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4345    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 18:03:46

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

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

The point is, that even with maximum protections, there will be some natural or man-made disaster that will wipe out a large percentage of them anyway, so allowing any ORVs on the beach is just bad policy.

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4346    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 18:03:46

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4347    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 18:03:46

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4348    **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 and my family. We appreciate that some disabled folks may have trouble accessing these areas so there should be some "handicapped" access available where ORVs might be allowed, with permitting in place, BUT as far as we're concerned the only "dissability" suffered by most ORV "enthusiasts" is their "thinking and emotional Disability" to see the destruction their toys create while they indulge their lack of values and their lack of respect for the environment and the futures of their own children as well as mine.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Personally I have NO interest in maintaining ORV areas at all but I don't see why they can't go elsewhere or get their "kicks" from other less destructive activities. Other resources such as fishing, both sport and commercial, are often restricted or curtailed when fish stocks are threatened with depletion for years at a time...why not have a moratorium on ORVs when bird and turtle life or wild areas are threatened...then have them re-open on a trial basis when things "normalize"....I still don't think it's normal to careen about the countryside on an ORV looking for "cheap thrills" One might as well hit the Nimitz or Hollywood freeways in Metropolitan California at rush hour and then weave around through traffic and ride the shoulder on the ORV's for real thrills!  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. We will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4349    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:03:52  
**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:** 4350    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:03:52  
**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:** 4351    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:03:52  
**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:** 4352    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:03:52  
**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:** 4353    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:03:52  
**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:** 4354    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:03:52  
**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:** 4355    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:03:58  
**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:** 4356    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:03:58  
**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:** 4357    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:04:00  
**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:** 4358    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:04:00  
**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:** 4359    **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.  
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 turtle.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4360    **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:  
\*Vehicles should not be allowed on beaches anywhere, most particularly on our National Seashores. There are safety issues for humans and wildlife. One of the main purposes of our wonderful National Park system is to preserve and protect our natural resources, landscapes and environments. Allowing ORV's on our seashores make that task considerably more difficult, if not impossible. This is a national issue, not just a local or regional issue.  
\* Put Natural 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 protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4361    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:04:05  
**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:** 4362    **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. With the devastating oil spills and changing sea conditions, we must do everything we can to help our sea birds and turtles survive.

In my opinion, all ORV's should be banned from fragile habitat, but I know you have to allow more access. So following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

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

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

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

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

**Correspondence ID:** 4363    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 18:04:06

**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:** 4364    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 18:04:06

**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:** 4365    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private



**Received:** May,06,2010 18:04:12

**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:** 4366    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 18:04:12

**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:** 4367    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 18:04:12

**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:** 4368    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 18:04:12

**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:** 4369    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 18:04:12

**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:** 4370    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 18:04:17

**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:** 4371    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 18:04:17

**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:** 4372    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 18:04:17

**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:** 4373    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 18:04:17

**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:** 4374    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 18:04:17  
**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:** 4375    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:04:17  
**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:** 4376    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:04:23  
**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:** 4377    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 18:04:23  
**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:** 4378    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:04:23  
**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:** 4379    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:04:23  
**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:** 4380    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 18:04:23

**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:** 4381    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 18:04:23

**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:** 4382    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 18:04:28

**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:** 4383    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 18:04:28

**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:** 4384    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 18:04:28

**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:** 4385    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 18:04:28

**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:** 4386    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 18:04:28

**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:** 4387    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 18:04:29

**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:** 4388    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 18:04:33

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Correspondence ID:** 4389    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private



**Received:** May,06,2010 18:04:33  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
 This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
 The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
 \*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
 \* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
 \* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4390    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:04:33  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:**

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4391    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:04:39  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:**

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4392    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 18:04:39

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Correspondence ID:** 4393    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 18:04:39

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Correspondence ID:** 4394    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 18:04:39

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Correspondence ID:** 4395    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May.06.2010 18:04:39  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
 This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
 The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
 \*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
 \* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
 \* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4396    **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 have often enjoyed off-roading at Cape Hatteras National Seashore. It is precisely for this reason, that I wish to add my voice to this issue. Sound conservation, habitat and wildlife conservation interests really do need to have priority. That is why I fully support the environmentally preferred Alternative D 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:** 4397    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.06.2010 18:04:44  
**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:** 4398    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:04:44  
**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:** 4399    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:04:44  
**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:** 4400    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:04:44  
**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:** 4401    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:04:44  
**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:** 4402    **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.  
It also seems inappropriate to be providing access to energy-wasting, noise-polluting vehicles at a time when conservation means not just protecting land, but also reducing and eventually eliminating frivolous, non-productive use of energy resources, such as fuels used to run off-road recreational vehicles. Their owners have the same access any of us do...their recreational vehicles have no such right.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4403    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:04:44  
**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:** 4404    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:04:47  
**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:** 4405    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:04:49  
**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:** 4406    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:04:49  
**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:** 4407    **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.  
Comments on the DEIS for the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Off-Road Vehicle Management Plan  
Dear Superintendent Murray,  
I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This plan offers a better balance of uses while protecting endangered and threatened species. I've witnessed people walking past enclosures for Piping Plovers, wondering what the fencing was for. I was able to explain the reasons for the enclosures to an audience of beach-lovers who also wanted the opportunity to use the beach with their OVRs. Once they realized that the two beach uses could co-exist, they were fine with limiting OVR access during the nesting season.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4408    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.06,2010 18:04:55  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4409    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.06,2010 18:04:55  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

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

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4410    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:04:55  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4411    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:04:55  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4412    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Freeland, Penny  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:05:43  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Pet restrictions  
I am writing, because as a resident of Hatteras Island, I have some objections to your proposals for beach access restrictions. In particular, I object to the proposed pet restrictions. As a pet owner, I actually bought my house here on the Outer Banks so I could walk with my dogs on the beach. It is a big part of the culture of the Outer Banks, as most of the rentals here allow pets and it is a big reason why tourists choose the Outer Banks, when vacationing. This will hurt the economy, which is already threatened by beach closings to fishermen. Furthermore, there is no science to support such restrictions.  
My pets are always on leashes and we enjoy walking the shoreline. It has been awful, the last two years, with so many beaches being closed to us. Since birds do not nest on shorelines, it seems unfair to close the beaches to pedestrians and pets. It is an infringement of my freedom.  
Real estate rentals will surely suffer if pets are restricted from the beaches. Many tourists come here for this reason, because they can bring their pets. Most house rentals allow pets for free, or a nominal fee. If pets are no longer allowed on beaches, tourists will choose other vacation destinations where pets are welcome. The economy here is already failing, due to two years of beach access restrictions. To restrict pets will only makes things worse. The



families who live here rely on tourism for seasonal income.

There are only two paragraphs in your proposal that discuss the culture of the Outer Banks and pets are a big part of that culture, for the residents, as well as visitors. This needs to be addressed.

Where is the science to support such closings? I did research and could find no evidence that pets caused harm or death to the species being protected. Without substance, how can these restrictions make sense? If there is no good reason to restrict pets from beaches, why is this being proposed? Please help to put an end to this proposal. Pets are not a threat to the wildlife on the Outer Banks.

Sincerely,  
Penny Freeland

**Correspondence ID:** 4413    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Browning, H L

**Received:** May,06,2010 18:06:53

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** H. L. Browning PO Box 4 Climax, NC 27233

May 6, 2010

Mr. Michael B. Murray, Superintendent Cape Hatteras National Seashore 1401 National Park Drive Manteo, NC 27954

Subject: Public Comments - Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS)

Mr. Murray:

I appreciate the opportunity to provide my comments on the DEIS. Like many others, I have concerns that I hope will be considered without prejudice. I disagree with Alternative F in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. All of the restrictions are far too excessive, especially the buffers around each Piping Plover nest. The US Fish and Wildlife scientist established the appropriate and effective buffer as 200 meters. Peer reviewed science supporting 1000 meter buffers does not exist. That distance equals 771 acres of land for the chicks to forage on. The chicks never forage towards the tide line, always parallel or in the direction away from it. The 1000 meter buffer is totally unwarranted and Cape Hatteras Seashore Recreational Area deserves equal treatment with all other established nesting area buffers! Access corridors around nesting areas would provide valuable access without impairment or damage to protected resources.

I also disagree with permanent closure of Hatteras Inlet and Ocracoke Inlet. National Park Services' own maps show that not one pair of Piping Plovers has nested at either location during the last 3 breeding seasons. There is no legal justification for closing these areas.

The Audubon, Defenders of Wildlife, and Southern Environmental Law Center are the plaintiffs in this current litigation and are responsible for these current actions along with Federal Judge Terrence Boyle. The Supreme Court ruled in Lujan vs. Defenders of Wildlife, 1992, that you must be able to show "real harm" or "injury in fact" in order to sue the government. The plaintiffs did not have the ability to show either by admission of the scientist solicited by the Audubon Society and still do not today. Nonetheless, Judge Boyle granted them standing.

The plaintiff's claim of harm is based on pure speculation, which the Supreme Court says is not enough to grant standing in Federal Court. It is my opinion that the Consent Decree which resulted from the illegal actions of Judge Boyle is null and void.

There is only 1 documented case of harm caused to a Piping Plover chick. In this case, the chick was killed by a Park Service employee checking a nest.

I urge the use common sense and above all?Ethics, when making the final decisions regarding the Access Issues at Cape Hatteras National Seashore "Recreational Area." Consider the plight of the business owners, families, and property owners that depend on visitors for their livelihood. It will be unfortunate if the future of this community is determined based on the speculation and opinions of environmental extremist and one judge, rather than the legal justification required as established by the Supreme Court. Consider too, the public's right to access to a treasured environment to which, it also, has a rightful place.

The generous citizens who donated the land to the National Park Service and citizens of the United States were promised by the Congress of the United States of America that we would always have access, not "partial access." I respectfully request that these promises not be disregarded in this decision.

Respectfully,  
H.L. Browning

**Correspondence ID:** 4414    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Freeland, Penny

**Received:** May,06,2010 18:07:16

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Parks Department:

I am writing, because as a resident of Hatteras Island, I have some objections to your proposals for beach access restrictions. In particular, I object to the beach access restrictions set forth in your preferred plan, F.

I believe restricting access to the proposed 8 beaches, plus the closing of the inlets to ORV's and pedestrians will have a disastrous affect on the economy on Hatteras and Ocracoke Islands. Since the implementation of the court decree, the businesses here have been steadily failing. How could this not be true, given that the islands depend upon fishermen, sports enthusiasts and tourists, for the majority of its income.

Closing the beaches means fewer visitors to the two islands. This has already been happening during the last two years and the proposed plan F will be even more restrictive, resulting in even fewer visitors to the islands.

Fewer visitors means that my house value will go down. I could understand this, if there was science to support it, as I would not want to hurt any form of wildlife, but the fact is that the plover population has actually dwindled with the current restrictions court decree that is currently in place. The truth is that the presence of pedestrians and ORV's is actually beneficial to the birds in questions, as it keeps the other predators away.

It does not make sense to restrict beach access on an Island that only has beaches to offer its visitors. We do not have major attractions, outside of the ocean and sound. The closing of Cape Point won't do anything for the birds, as it is too transient a place for birds to nest. This is also true of the inlets.

We will quickly fall without open beach access. We need a plan that will protect the birds, as well as the families who live on the islands and depend on tourism for survival.

You need to complete an analysis of the cultural impact these restrictions will have on the islands, as required by the National Environmental Policy Act. I urge you to do so before any permanent plan is implemented.

Sincerely,  
Penny Freeland

**Correspondence ID:** 4415    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Deane, Michael J

**Received:** May,06,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** As an avid angler on the North Carolina seashore, I am strongly opposed to the National Park Service (NPS) preferred alternative, Alternative F, in the DEIS and urge you to make significant changes to the preferred alternative in order to provide both reasonable resource protection and reasonable public access to public land. Recreational fishing is one of the most enjoyable American pastimes, and Cape Hatteras National Seashore has some of the best surf fishing locations on the east coast ? accessible only by ORV.

Alternative F is the most restrictive management option to date, far exceeding any sense of balance between resource protection and public access and betraying all promises made to the public regarding recreational uses in the seashore. The majority of the provisions included within the preferred alternative far exceed anything proposed by a majority of the Negotiated Rulemaking Committee, including excessively large resource closures (buffers), unnecessary year-round and floating closures, and the lack of access corridors around or through resource closures.

In order to restore balance to the DEIS, I highly recommend that the NPS revisit the proposal put forth to the Negotiated Rulemaking Committee in

December of 2009. It provides the necessary protections for wildlife resources while having the support of a majority of the local community. Without reasonable ORV access, responsible anglers like me, and the local economy that is supported by recreational fishing, suffer greatly. I urge you to provide a better balance between resource protection and recreational uses by incorporating the December 2009 recommendations from the Negotiated Rulemaking Committee into the preferred alternative.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4416    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Freeland, Penny  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:08:27  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am writing, because as a resident of Hatteras Island, I have some objections to your proposals for beach access restrictions. In particular, I object to your preferred plan F, which restricts beach access to pedestrians.  
There is simply no science to support these restrictions. Pedestrians are not a threat to the wildlife on our beaches. We have always been stewards of this island!  
Please do not close our beaches to pedestrians.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4417    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Hults, David 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, David Hults

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4418    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Freeland, Penny  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:14:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am writing, because as a resident of Hatteras Island, I have some objections to your proposals for beach access restrictions. In particular, I object to your preferred plan F, which restricts beach access to ORV's.  
There is simply no science to support these restrictions. ORV's are not a threat to the wildlife on our beaches. We have always been stewards of this island! Birds do not nest near tidelines on the beaches. Restricting ORV's will do nothing to protect the birds.  
Please do not close our beaches to ORV's. It will only hurt tourism on the islands.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4419    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Stone, William G  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:18:34  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please help keep the beach safe for birds and bathers, and limit motorized vehicles as much as possible.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4420    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:30:08  
**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:** 4421    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:30:08  
**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:** 4422    **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.  
With humans emphasizing economic growth for the few centuries, we are at a point where a new type of growth needs to be emphasized: inner growth. Reducing or preventing ORV allows for people to truly connect to their world. So, this alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. Humans can only then feel peace within and out.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4423    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:30:10  
**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:** 4424    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:30:10  
**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:** 4425    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:30:22  
**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:** 4426    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, Bianca  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:30:25  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am age 9 and I want you to leave the beach alone.We didn't hurt the birds they hurt themselves.I always loved to go to the beach and see the oceanlife.But now I can't.I would love to be able to go and see all the wildlife again.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4427    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:30:26  
**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:** 4428    **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 firmly believe that the protection of the plants and animals that live on the seashore should have priority over vehicles and pedestrian traffic. There are lots of other places for people to drive but not many other places for these precious birds, turtles and sealife to inhabit.  
 This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
 The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
 \*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
 \* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
 \* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4429    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:30:42  
**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:** 4430    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:30:42  
**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:** 4431    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:30:42  
**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:** 4432    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:30:42  
**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:** 4433    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:30:47  
**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:** 4434    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:30:47  
**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:** 4435    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:30:49  
**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:** 4436    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:30:49  
**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:** 4437    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:30:53  
**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:** 4438    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:30:54  
**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.  
For many years, our family spent our summer vacation on the Outer Banks. We have many fond memories of our times there. We are avid birders and would strongly support any means which can be taken to protect the birds and sea turtles in the area,

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4439    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:30:54  
**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:** 4440    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:30:58  
**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:** 4441    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Lewis, Jack D  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:30:59  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** To: Mike Murray, Superintendent Cape Hatteras National Seashore Manteo, NC 27954

Regarding the National Park Service (NPS) Draft Environmental Statement (DEIS) I would like to comment as follows: The Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area (CHNSRA) was established by Congress in 1937 for the use of the citizens of this country as a recreational area. The DEIS plan will violate the long standing historical and cultural heritage of the area. Beach driving was the main route of transportation prior to the building of paved roads. Beach driving has continued throughout the history of the island for access for commercial and recreational fishing, many other recreational activities as well as to provide access for the handicapped to areas that would otherwise be inaccessible. The CHNSRA was established for the residents and visitors of the islands. It is for recreation, it is not a wildlife preserve. There are other vast areas set aside for wildlife preserves such as Pea Island which are not open to ORV traffic.

I disagree with the DEIS Restrictive Species Management Areas (page 468) and I feel that ML1 is overly restrictive. I urge the NPS to adopt the corridors and bypasses as outlined in the Coalition for Beach Access Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area ORV Access Environmental Impact Position Statement as a more commonsense and reasonable plan. I disagree with the DEIS large, inflexible buffers (pages 121-127) as I feel they are too extreme. The current 1000 meter buffer for nests equals 771 acres per nest, this is far exceeds any realistic and reasonable need for protection of the nests. The Piping Plover breeding/nesting buffer should not exceed 50 meters. The unfledged piping plover chick buffer should not exceed 200 meters and should move with the brood as it relocates to reliable food sources not simply expand. These ORV buffers as well as corridors should be maintained to allow ORV's to pass through or around nesting areas to ensure beach access is always maintained.

The 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 (p.124).

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%- highly significant Storm / Lunar Tides: 29% -highly significant Nest Abandonment: 6% Avian Predation: 5% Ghost Crab Predation: 3% Human Interference: 3%-least significant

The NPS does not adequately consider locations neighboring the Recreational Area that are part of the same ecosystem such as villages, dredge and spoil islands and Pea Island National Wildlife Refuge. The 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 disagree with the NPS statement: "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 night time driving on the beach." (p. 377). In actuality, 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" and direct hatchling mortality from human activity has not "frequently occurred". The main danger to the nests is natural predators and weather with ORV driving having a minimal impact. The NPS should adopt more proactive techniques such as used at other east coast locations to improve the protection of the nests.

The island economy has already been severely negatively impacted due to the consent decree restrictions. The current DEIS will only serve to be even more restrictive and it will surely further devastate an already precarious economic situation for the people of the island villages. The Region of Influence (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 villages. 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.

Economic analyses in the DEIS do not use data from the first full year of the Consent Decree (2009) thus do not present an accurate picture of economic impact to the seashore villages. Many 2008 visitors were either unaware of the scope and breadth of Consent Decree beach closures, or had already made plans/reservations. Actual seashore village business survey data should be used rather than the model projections currently in the 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. The definition of the Region of Influence (ROI), faulty data on economic activity generated by specific type recreational activity, incomplete visitation/business survey data, inflated overall Seashore visitor counts pertaining to beach use, and flawed key assumptions concerning the maintenance of access under Alternative F, all lead to inaccurate conclusions in the socioeconomic analyses. Specifically, these inaccuracies can be seen as understating the negative socio-economic impact of the Seashore Villages. Further, this negative impact will be absorbed almost entirely by Small Businesses. Neither of these important aspects of the management alternatives are adequately presented in the DEIS.

I find it morally unacceptable that the NPS has been actively killing hundreds of various predator species in the park. It is also a financially irresponsible use of tax dollars for the murder of innocent animals. Human and ORV presence is a significant deterrent to predators, if access is limited, more killing will be needed to "protect" the birds and turtles.

I strongly urge the NPS to carefully consider the Coalition for Beach Access Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area ORV Access Environmental Impact Position Statement The positions stated in that document and its attachments represent a common sense, reasonable approach to address two of the most significant responsibilities the National Park Service must fulfill within the ORV Management Plan. These responsibilities are: The protection of resources without impairment to or from the visiting public and the protection of Traditional, Cultural, Recreational and Commercial values for the visiting public with limited disruption. The goals written by Congress in the enabling legislation that created the Recreational Area recognized these responsibilities. The Coalition is confident ORV access to the beaches has not historically adversely affected the Recreational Area

environment. The Coalition is equally confident that, in the future, the ORV management plan guidelines it endorses will not negatively impact the environmental qualities that were responsible for the creation of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area and its continued popularity.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4442    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:31:00  
**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:** 4443    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:31:04  
**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:** 4444    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:31:04  
**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:** 4445    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:31:18  
**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:** 4446    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:31:22  
**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:** 4447    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:31:22  
**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:** 4448    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:31:26  
**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:** 4449    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:31:26  
**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:** 4450    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:31:26  
**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:** 4451    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:31:48  
**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:** 4452    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:31:48  
**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:** 4453    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:32:07  
**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:** 4454    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:32:07  
**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:** 4455    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:32:07  
**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:** 4456    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:32:07  
**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:** 4457    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:32:07  
**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:** 4458    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:32:33  
**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:** 4459    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:32:33  
**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:** 4460    **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.  
Cape Hatteras is a place near and dear to my heart, having vacationed there dozens of times since I was 5 years old in the late 1950s. Over the years, I have seen the growth of off road vehicles on the beaches, and it makes me very sad. And to learn that these vehicles are causing great harm to nesting bird groups and sea turtles makes me mad.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4461    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:32:33  
**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:** 4462    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:32:33  
**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:** 4463    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:32:33  
**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:** 4464    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:32:33  
**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:** 4465    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:32:42  
**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:** 4466    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:32:44  
**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:** 4467    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:32:44  
**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:** 4468    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:32:46  
**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:** 4469    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:32:47  
**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.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4470    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:32:51  
**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:** 4471    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:32:51  
**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.

as breeding ones.

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4472    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:32:53  
**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:** 4473    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:32:53  
**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:** 4474    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:33:02  
**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:** 4475    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.06,2010 18:33:02  
**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:** 4476    **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.  
Honestly, I don't think it at all appropriate for ORVs to be using such a location. The idea is to enjoy and preserve nature. People wanting to use those should go to an indoor track/park where they can keep the fumes, noise, disturbance and destruction to themselves. It doesn't make any sense at all to be using these in a national park much less on beaches.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4477    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.06,2010 18:33:02  
**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:** 4478    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:33:03  
**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:** 4479    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:33:03  
**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 look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4480    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:33:03  
**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:** 4481    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:33:12  
**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:** 4482    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:33:15  
**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:** 4483    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:33:19  
**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:** 4484    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:33:21  
**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:** 4485    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:33:21  
**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:** 4486    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 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:** 4487    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 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:** 4488    **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.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Management targets in the DEIS need thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. We will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4489    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 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:** 4490    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:33:31  
**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.  
ORV's already have an overwhelming portion of the seashore to motor around on. I certainly enjoy driving them myself on designated trails but see no reasonable argument to allow unlimited access on the shore 12 months a year. The National Seashore's primary directive should achieve a balance between wildlife protection and a natural recreation area for all people. I can guarantee that if you're not actually driving one of these ORV's, then the noise, danger and environmental damage associated with these practices would negatively impact one's experience, let alone the wildlife.  
I assume the ORV contingent is worried that this statement would set a precedent and slowly, the amount of seashore available to ORV will diminish. Frankly, it appears this over-represented portion of the population has had more than enough access and privileges to practice their unequivocally destructive pastime over the years. It's time to responsibly manage the seashore for everyone's enjoyment and everything's existence, not simply for the segment that produces the loudest noise.  
Sincerely, Simon Kline Wilmington, North Carolina

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4491    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:33:31  
**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:** 4492    **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.  
The problem seems to be that people cannot learn to share this national parks. Have a area for the ORV'S and leave enough room for people who want a quiet beach, and want to protect the wild life. We cannot let a small group of assertive individuals take over the whole place. We have the same problem in the mountains of Western North Carolina where noisy motorcycles and ORV's tear up property.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4493    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:33:31  
**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:** 4494    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:33:31  
**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:** 4495    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:33:32  
**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:** 4496    **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 Nat'l Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras Nat'l Seashore.

Of the alternative plans presented, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

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

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

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

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

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

**Correspondence ID:** 4497    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:33:41  
**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:** 4498    **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. Both features are important to me. I last visited the Cape in the mid-1970s, but have long looked forward to a return visit. I have been saddened to learn that off-road vehicles have been able and allowed to pre-empt or disturb wildlife habitat and pedestrian use.

Whether based on Alternative D or developed in another way, the final plan for the park should include the following features:

\*Fair and balanced access for all visitors.

Under NPS' preferred Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach: less than 1/4. This balance would be unfair. At least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife, preferably with more walkways and better access facilities., this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to historic numbers and diversity.

\* Priority to protection of natural resources

Recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species.

Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and may require increase to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Clear wildlife recovery goals

A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Management targets in the DEIS need to be based on the historic potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Goals are needed for migrating and wintering species as well as for breeding species.

\* Management to realize the recovery goals

Management must be adequate to realize the recovery goals. Based in annual reviews, additional protective measures for birds, turtles and plants should be instituted until the goals are met.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I look forward to a final plan that provides better balance for all visitors and better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4499    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:33:41  
**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:** 4500    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:33:41  
**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:** 4501    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:33:43  
**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:** 4502    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:33:43  
**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:** 4503    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:33:43  
**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:** 4504    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:33:43  
**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:** 4505    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:33:46  
**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:** 4506    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:33:46  
**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:** 4507    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:41:06  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Cape Hatteras National Seashore is a gem! It is a place that can not be experienced anywhere else in the world. My family goes there twice a year to vacation all the way from Indiana. It would be terrible to think that our trips to the beach would be limited in the future because the beach access is limited. Please listen to the people of the Outer Banks and all that love it and keep the beach open!  
Thanks

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4508    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Moore, Craig  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:44:02  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** While I respect the wildlife of our state and country, this is excessive. The harm to our economy is significant and underestimated. In these almost impossible economic times the hardship to our state, business's on Hatteras Island the hardship it would cause my family may be unrecoverable. Please do not allow the closure of our beaches and harm tourism beyond repair to Hatteras Island.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4509    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 18:58:14  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** May 6, 2010 To National Park Service of Hatteras Island, NC Mr. Mike Murray, Superintendent  
 As a longtime property owner, vacationer, fisherman and dog-lover I find your proposed ORV Management Plan beyond the boundaries of good management practices. What you are proposing will significantly impact the overall economic viability of Hatteras Island and the people who have lived and worked there for generations. I am sure that you can go back to the "drawing board" and come up with a plan that will insure the Island will stay the wonderful wildlife preserve that it is, but not mean economic disaster for the people that depend on the beaches, sound and ocean for their livelihood. The rules and policies that you want to adopt have a far-reaching scope that covers all human access in addition to resource management within the recreational area. I am in total disagreement with your projected plan and would like you to reconsider this project. Should you wish to contact me I may be reached by e-mail at salayman@directv.net. Sincerely, Sharon A. Layman

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4510    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 19:00:22  
**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:** 4511    **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 a conservative and a lifelong sportsman/hunter-not your stereotype bunny hugger.I am also a combat disabled veteran-and if I can enjoy this park without a noisy,smelly ORV then so can the mostly overweight, lazy people that rely on them.Let us leave the beach the way God made it,for our kids and their kids to use in peace.  
 This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
 The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
 \*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
 \* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
 \* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4512    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 19:00:22  
**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:** 4513    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 19:00:22  
**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:** 4514    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 19:00:23  
**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:** 4515    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 19:00:27  
**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:** 4516    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 19:00:27  
**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:** 4517    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 19:00:27  
**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.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4518    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 19:00:34  
**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, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be

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

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4519    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 19:00:34  
**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.  
Please protect the wildlife at Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Do not allow off-road vehicles to destroy the scenic beauty and conservation efforts.  
Thank you!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4520    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 19:00:34  
**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, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4521    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 19:00:43  
**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:** 4522    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 19:00:46  
**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, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

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

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

**Correspondence ID:** 4523    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 19:00:46  
**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, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 4524    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 19:00:54  
**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:** 4525    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 19:00:56  
**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:** 4526    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 19:00:56  
**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.  
We need to protect our wildlife more than ever. I'm all for man made playgrounds for man made vehicles, but please leave the natural habitat for nature. Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4527    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 19:00:56  
**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.  
Please protect valuable habitat!  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4528    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 19:01:05  
**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:** 4529    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 19:01:05  
**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.  
 Think of the long-term implications of these decisions. We have to think of what kind of a place we will leave for our grandchildren and their grandchildren. This is why I support alternatives as described below.  
 This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
 The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
 \*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
 \* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
 \* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4530    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 19:01:06  
**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:** 4531    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 19:01:06  
**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.

as breeding ones.

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4532    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 19:01:08  
**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.  
For too many years, the interests of ORV groups, which represent just a small, but very vocal, percentage of Cape Hatteras visitors, have outweighed the interests of the two million people that visit this dynamic seashore every year. As the Park Service's DEIS points out, what is decided now will guide what happens at Cape Hatteras for decades and will set a precedent for other national parks.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4533    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 19:01:08  
**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:** 4534    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 19:01:17  
**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:** 4535    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 19:01:17  
**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.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a

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

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

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4536    **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 Cape Hatteras National Seashore Off-Road Vehicle management plan. I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D 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. Sincerely, Gerry Luginbuhl 1700 Pictou Rd Raleigh, NC 27606

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4537    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 19:01:17  
**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:** 4538    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 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:** 4539    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 19:01:37  
**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:** 4540    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 19:01:40  
**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:** 4541    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 19:01:40  
**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-Off Road Vehicle uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at

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

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

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

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

**Correspondence ID:** 4542    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 19:01:48

**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.

My husband and I will be retiring next year and will be traveling to many of the places on the east coast where we can see wildlife, especially birds. We hope that enlightened management at Cape Hatteras will make this a stop that still has many birds to see.

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Correspondence ID:** 4543    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 19:01:48

**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:** 4544    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 19:01:55

**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:** 4545    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 19:01:58

**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:** 4546    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 19:01:58

**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. I wish you and yours health and peace.

**Correspondence ID:** 4547    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 19:01:58

**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:** 4548    **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 can't tell you how long it's been since I stopped bothering to visit beaches in my own area because of the smell of gas fumes from ORV's and jet ski use. ORV's really don't belong on the beaches, but limited use should be OK for all if that is the only way to give everyone equal access and save the animals who rely on the area to breed and live.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4549    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 19:02:14  
**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:** 4550    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 19:02:14  
**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:** 4551    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May.06,2010 19:02:16

**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:** 4552    **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.

I would prefer ORV's to be prohibited from driving on 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:** 4553    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May.06,2010 19:02:16

**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:** 4554    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 19:02:50

**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:** 4555    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 19:02:50

**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:** 4556    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 19:02:50

**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:** 4557    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 19:02:55

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Correspondence ID:** 4558    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 19:02:57

**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:** 4559    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 19:03:01

**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:** 4560    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 19:03:01  
**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:** 4561    **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 and my family frequently vacation at Cape Hatteras. We appreciate and enjoy the wildlife. It should be protected.

**Correspondence ID:** 4562    **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 more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Having grown up in the area, I used to love watching the birds and thus started my lifelong interest in birds. Please allow our children and grandchildren an opportunity to do the same. People go to the beaches to enjoy the scenery and feel of being out of the city and someplace more natural. It gives them a chance to recharge and reconnect with the world that will be lost if the wildness is destroyed and the natural sounds of wind and surf are obliterated by motorized vehicles. Please preserve this environment.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4563    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 19:03:17  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me and our country. It is important that we protect the future of wildlife. Otherwise our grandchildren will not have the quality of life that we have.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4564    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 19:03:17  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4565    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 19:03:22  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4566    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 19:03:24  
**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:** 4567    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 19:03:24  
**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.  
The vast majority of people who use our national parks do not use these accursed off road vehicles. They have to be controlled and kept away from damaging wildlife.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4568    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 19:03:24  
**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:** 4569    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 19:03:24  
**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:** 4570    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 19:03:35  
**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:** 4571    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 19:03:35  
**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:** 4572    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 19:03:35  
**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 AND VITAL TO OUR 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:** 4573    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 19:03:46  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4574    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 19:03:46  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan

are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4575    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 19:03:46  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4576    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 19:03:46  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4577    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 19:03:52  
**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:** 4578    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 19:03:53  
**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:** 4579    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 19:03:53  
**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:** 4580    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 19:03:53  
**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:** 4581    **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 hope 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:** 4582    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 19:30:11  
**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:** 4583    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 19:30:11  
**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:** 4584    **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 should be the purpose of a protected seashore.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\* Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and any recreational use should be consistent with this protection. I believe that beaches should be free of vehicles, but the preferred plan fails to set aside areas that are free of ORV use year round in order to protect the wildlife. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. Your plan must include clear goals for wildlife recovery. The management targets in the DEIS, require more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 4585    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 19:30:12  
**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:** 4586    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 19:30:23  
**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:** 4587    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private



**Received:** May,06,2010 19:30:23  
**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.  
 The last habitats available to animals should not be destroyed. Our country and our world are at a tipping point for habitat; there is simply no more to develop.  
 This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
 The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
 \*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
 \* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
 \* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4588    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 19:30:23  
**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:** 4589    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 19:30:25  
**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. Someone needs to speak for those who cannot speak for themselves.  
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4590    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 19:30:25  
**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:** 4591    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 19:30:25  
**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:** 4592    **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.  
My mother's family is from North Carolina, and I have always wanted to see Cape Hatteras. Please do what you can to protect the wildlife there. If I ever do get to make the trip, I hope to be in a place that protects birds and turtles and where the sounds of wind and waves are not drowned out by ATV's and "beach buggies."  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4593    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 19:30:42  
**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:** 4594    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 19:30:44  
**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:** 4595    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 19:30:44  
**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:** 4596    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 19:30:44  
**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.  
I know about the impact of ORVs on endangered beach-nesting birds from firsthand experience. I'm the president of the North Fork Audubon Society, located on the North Fork of Long Island, New York.  
Like Cape Hatteras, we have long, sandy beaches that provide the ONLY nesting environment that Piping Plovers and Least Terns, among others, will use.  
The numbers of these birds are so diminished, every single fledged chick counts towards the survival of the species. And ORV's are an EXTREMELY significant threat. As significant as high tides, storms, gulls, raccoons and domestic and feral cats. I have personally witnessed FLATTENED plovers in tire tracks on the beach. The vehicle barrels along, and the nesting bird, stay on the nest, not moving. End of story.  
These birds must be able to use the beaches safely, to ensure reproduction of the species. If their nesting habitat continues to be lost or compromised, these species will become extinct.  
This is the reality. I'm not exaggerating.  
Sincerely, Diana Van Buren President, North Fork Audubon Society

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4597    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 19:30:56  
**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:** 4598    **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. .  
\* Put Natural 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.  
Have you ever tried to be on a beach where ORVs are? One ORV with two people on board can make it impossible for 100 families to enjoy a stretch of beach. And the "fun" the folks in the ORV have is so destructive!!!! Their destruction of the beach and the flora and fauna remains decades after they have gone home.  
This is just wrong. Keeping half of the beach safe from destruction seems to me to be a bare minimum of what should be set aside. The impact of ORV on the environment is way out of proportion to the number of people "enjoying" the beach in this destructive manner.  
Save the beach for the people who want to treasure it, not for those that want to destroy it.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4599    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 19:30:57  
**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:** 4600    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 19:30:58

**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.

Believe is or not, survival is not all about us. We need a healthy biosphere for the human race to survive. We don't need one destroyed by ORVs. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

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

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

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

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

**Correspondence ID:** 4601    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 19:31:10

**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:** 4602    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 19:31:10

**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:** 4603    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 19:31:10

**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:** 4604    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Lingsch, Steve C

**Received:** May,06,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Cape Hatteras National Seashore holds a unique ecological, recreational and economic value. I believe that beaches are a public resource and should be held in the public trust for their preservation. Cape Hatteras National Seashore provides some of the best recreational resources on the East Coast, including surfing and fishing, but I recognize that if not regulated correctly ORV use may detrimentally affect migratory species that nest in the area. I believe that a balance between access and preservation can be achieved and that allowing continued access with improved management of ORV use to the National Seashore is the optimal solution for this area.

As a homeowner of the Outer Banks, (Avon) and a stakeholder in the long term preservation of the Outer Banks, 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:** 4605    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 19:31:12

**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.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4606    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 19:31:12  
**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.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4607    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 19:31:27  
**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:** 4608    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 19:31:27  
**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:** 4609    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 19:31:31  
**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 as a longtime sea turtle protection volunteer.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4610    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 19:31:31  
**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:** 4611    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 19:31:31  
**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:** 4612    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 19:31:31  
**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:** 4613    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 19:31:32  
**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:** 4614    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 19:31:34  
**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:** 4615    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 19:31:51  
**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:** 4616    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 19:31:51  
**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:** 4617    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 19:31:51  
**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:** 4618    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 19:31:51  
**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:** 4619    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 19:31:58  
**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:** 4620    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 19:32:02  
**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:** 4621    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 19:32:02  
**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:** 4622    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 19:32:02  
**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:** 4623    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 19:32:04  
**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:** 4624    **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.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors.  
\* Put Natural Resources First.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4625    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 19:32:27  
**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:** 4626    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 19:32:27  
**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:** 4627    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 19:32:27  
**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:** 4628    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 19:32:29  
**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:** 4629    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 19:32:38  
**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.  
Please remember that all species are necessary for our ecosystem to remain intact. We need to protect and preserve their habitats, sometimes from ourselves. Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4630    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 19:32:40  
**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:** 4631    **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 more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

By the way, I myself am a surf fisher, and I greatly enjoy coming to the OBX regularly to fish and enjoy the region's glorious bounty. I spend a lot of money around the local economy. Will ORV restrictions impact my ease in reaching those 'sweet spots'... the answer is, honestly, yes. However, wildlife conservation and recovery is far more important than any minor inconvenience I may suffer in getting to my favorite fishing points. I can and will adapt to whatever methods are proven to protect this beautiful resource and the creatures that call it home. There are always new places to hike in and fish, and - for us humans - recreational fishing is a hobby. For wildlife, this is species survival we are discussing. It's no game to them. It is life or death. If the figures are true/accurate, then they are alarming, and I will gladly support directives that work to ensure native species repopulation and growth.

**Correspondence ID:** 4632    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 19:32:42

**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. ORV's have been killing wild life and destroying in the desert for a long time, do you want this to happen to you.

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

**Correspondence ID:** 4633    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 19:32:42

**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:** 4634    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 19:33:05

**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:** 4635    **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 more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

The wildlife and flora that are endangered and threatened by ORV use are the very things our citizens go to such beautiful national landmarks such as Cape Hatteras to see. Please do not make the terrible mistake of allowing ORV use for the few at the expense of the many.



**Correspondence ID:** 4636    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 19:33:09

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

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

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

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

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4637    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 19:50:51

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** All,

I strongly supports open and accessible beaches for the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area. I believe in open access for everyone consistent with the enabling legislation that created America's first National Seashore.

I support resource protection for sea turtles and shorebirds. However, the buffers for the birds are too extensive and should be scaled back to more reasonable levels and access corridors should be allowed in all cases so that the public can access the open beach areas down the beach line as outlined in Dare County's DEIS Position Summary Statement (Page 7 ? Appendix "A").

Sincerely,  
35 Year Cape Hatteras Vacationer

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4638    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** HUBBARD-TOMPKINS, LAURA L

**Received:** May,06,2010 19:55:19

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** PLEASE DO WHATEVER IT TAKES TO SAVE THE BIRDS AND TURTLES AT CAPE HATTERAS. THANK YOU LAURA HUBBARD-TOMPKINS 5211 SINGER ROAD, LAS CRUCES NEW MEXICO. 88007 rwlht@juno.com

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4639    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Burke, Denice

**Received:** May,06,2010 19:59:27

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I disagree with the beach closings. For the last 33 years I have been enjoying the beaches of the Outer Banks as a vacation spot. I believe the environmentalist are wrong thinking that the beaches can not be shared equally by humans, pets and wildlife. Please do not close the beaches of Cape Hatteras. It would be a tragic lost/waste.

Denice Burke Glen Allen, VA

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4640    **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.

As an Audubon member, I believe that this alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

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

- \*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other 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. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
- \* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met.

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4641    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 20:00:22  
**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:** 4642    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 20:00:22  
**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:** 4643    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 20:00:22  
**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:** 4644    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 20:00:41  
**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:** 4645    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 20:00:43  
**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:** 4646    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 20:00:43  
**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:** 4647    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 20:00:43  
**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:** 4648    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 20:00:43  
**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:** 4649    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 20:00:45  
**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:** 4650    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 20:00:54  
**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:** 4651    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 20:00:56  
**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:** 4652    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 20:00:56  
**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:** 4653    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 20:01:19  
**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:** 4654    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 20:01:19  
**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:** 4655    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 20:01:19  
**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:** 4656    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 20:01:19  
**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:** 4657    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 20:01:29  
**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. WE ARE NOT THE ONLY SPECIES ON EARTH DONT ACT LIKE WE ARE. WE ARE TO BE STEWARDS OF GOD'S GREEN EARTH ,NOT BULLIES WITH A IRON FIST!! The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4658    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 20:01:29  
**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.  
I love nature and all that lives there. These creatures need all the help we can give them, especially with the current climate issues we all have to face.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4659    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 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:** 4660    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 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:** 4661    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 20:01:44  
**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:** 4662    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 20:01:46  
**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:** 4663    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 20:01:46  
**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:** 4664    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 20:01:48  
**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.  
The current oil spill in the Gulf of Mexico add to the clear evidence that we have to take every possible precaution to protect our natural resources and the animals that are already challenged by our encroachment into their environment.

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4665    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 20:01:48  
**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:** 4666    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 20:02:01  
**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:** 4667    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 20:02:03  
**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:** 4668    **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 more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.  
**ADDITIONALLY, I WOULD LIKE TO COMMENT THAT IT IS APPALLING THAT ORV VEHICLES ARE ALLOWED ON ENVIRONMENTALLY SENSITIVE LANDS AND BEACHES. THIS, NOT TO MENTION THE YEARLY RUN-OVERS AT BEACHES WHERE PEOPLE ARE INJURED OR HARMED. THIS TYPE OF VEHICLE SHOULD NEVER BE ALLOWED IN ANY ENVIRONMENTAL AREAS OR BEACH AREAS EVER. I AM PERSONALLY FRIGHTENED TO GO TO ANY OF THESE BEACH AREAS FOR FEAR SOMEONE WILL RUN OVER ME LET ALONE THE SEABIRDS AND TURTLES. SO, IN ESSENCE MY RIGHT TO GO TO THE BEACH IS ALSO BEING DENIED DUE TO FEAR OF INJURY. WHERE ARE MY RIGHTS? LET THESE PEOPLE GO TO DESIGNATED ROUGH TERRAIN AREAS AND CONTROL THE USE OF THESE VEHICLES.  
STOP ABUSING THE WILDLIFE AND ENVIRONMENT ... WE ARE THE CARETAKERS OF THESE CREATIONS, AND HELP US ALL WHEN THEY GO INTO EXTINCTION!**

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4669    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 20:02:03  
**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:** 4670    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 20:02:05  
**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:** 4671    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 20:02:16  
**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:** 4672    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 20:02:23  
**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:** 4673    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 20:02:24  
**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.

0010121

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

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4674    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 20:02:25  
**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.  
It seems that there is enough human induced pressures on our wildlife. Making space for wildlife that make these beaches home as well as nest sites, should be a priority. Cape Hatteras is a treasure. I have spent many summers there and hope to be back soon.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4675    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 20:02:47  
**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.  
Please take this chance to allow the birds of Cape Hatteras and pedestrians enjoy the tranquility of nature unharrassed by off road vehicles.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4676    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 20:02:47  
**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:** 4677    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 20:02:47  
**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:** 4678    **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 National Park Service mission is the preserve and protect the resources under its jurisdiction for the enjoyment of present and future visitors. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
 \* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4679    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 20:02:58  
**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:** 4680    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 20:02:59  
**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:** 4681    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 20:02:59  
**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. Please help to protect these precious animals.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4682    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 20:02:59  
**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.  
We're not doing a very good job for wildlife in the Gulf right now - I'm seeing adult sea turtles washing ashore that have died from the oil spill. Let's start trying to do a better job!  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4683    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 20:03:17  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4684    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 20:03:19  
**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:** 4685    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 20:03:19  
**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:** 4686    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 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:** 4687    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 20:03:23

**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:** 4688    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 20:03:24

**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.

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

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

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4689    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 20:03:24  
**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:** 4690    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 20:03:26  
**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:** 4691    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 20:03:30  
**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:** 4692    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 20:03:30  
**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:** 4693    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 20:03:34  
**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:** 4694    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 20:03:34  
**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:** 4695    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 20:03:34

**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:** 4696    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 20:03:34

**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:** 4697    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Letourneau, Oliver

**Received:** May,06,2010 20:11:09

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I disagree with the beach closings. I have been enjoying the beaches of the Outer Banks for the last 5 years. And want to continue doing so. I disagree with the environmentalist that the beaches can not be shared equally by humans, pets and wildlife. There is plenty of beach for all to go around.

Please do not close our beaches.

Thank you, Oliver Letourneau Aylett VA

**Correspondence ID:** 4698    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 20:12:40

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please do not allow this increase threat to our valuable seashore

**Correspondence ID:** 4699    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 20:19:07

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft Cape Hatteras National Seashore Off-Road Vehicle Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS).

I am opposed to the plan as written for the following reasons.

As a non-resident homeowner on Hatteras Island as well as a frequent visitor since 1969, the plan is far too overreaching and does not appear to be based on substantive, complete, analysis and evaluation. Specifically, out of the entire plan only two paragraphs are dedicated to the analysis of the

preservation of cultural resources. It would seem to me that analysis of all factors and objective conclusions should precede any proposed plan. Hatteras Island is home to a small, close-knit, community in which the residents care about each other as well as the environment in which they live. Visitors to the island appreciate and share those same values. Those on the island, residents and visitors, respect and preserve restricted areas such as those for turtle nestings and hatchings. The approach to preserving and enhancing the turtle population is reasonable and workable for all. This plan vastly limits beach access, particularly during certain times of the year. Though a threatened species, loggerhead turtle conservation plans coexist well with beach access regardless of the time of the year.

As I understand it, the Piping Plover is near-threatened. It is not threatened (including all three supporting UNIC 3.1 categories) or extinct in the wild. Providing for 1000 meter, or about 771 acres, closure in all directions of an unfledged chick broad appears to be very overreaching and unreasonable. Similarly, requiring a 300 meter all-direction closure around a American Oystercatcher appears to be in a similar overreaching manner. Furthermore, the American Oystercatcher is not federally threatened and is considered 'least concern' regarding its conservation status. These proposed closures are substantive and burdensome.

The year round residents and visitors are considerate of their environment. They keep the beaches clean, observe off road regulations, and respect all types of beach and wildlife preservation efforts. Overly limiting beach access will impact tourism to the area, the local economy, and investment in the area. This cannot be overstated. Decisions of this magnitude, such as implementing this proposed plan in April 2011, without substantive analysis and consideration for all factors are unacceptable to all. A plan that is a workable solution for all stakeholders is essential. There is a balance between maintain and hopefully improving the status of these species' conservations status and that of impact to the residents and visitors of Hatteras Island, but this is not it.

Please do not implement the proposed plan as written but instead require an objective study of all the pertinent factors (wildlife, economic, social, financial, etc) followed by a proposed plan for public comment. Respectfully submitted,  
Nate Davis

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4700    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Levy, Jay  
**Received:** May,06,2010 20:20:52  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I completely disagree with your plan to interfere with the enjoyment of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Please stop trying to regulate Mother Nature. Humans are as much a part of the ecology of any environment as any other creature. If any other species moved in to the area that you are trying to regulate and caused the same (unlikely) events that you believe would occur without regulation, you would (or more appropriately, should) consider it natural selection, i.e., survival of the fittest. However, you deem that some humans - usually remote, city-based so-called "environmentalists" somehow have all of the facts on their side, know what's best for the planet's survival, and can therefore dictate what will be required of the rest of us, who clearly must be wrong.

The folks that want to enjoy the beaches, their homes AND Mother Nature in this area will be completely and unnecessarily hampered by these draconian rules. Reasoned compromises have clearly been offered and should be considered carefully. My home is in Duck, NC so I'm not even directly impacted by this government interference, but I feel their pain. Leave things alone. The birds and turtles will survive and adapt. All beings can coexist if given the chance. This is just another example of government and self-righteous know-it-alls' sticking their noses where they have no business. Work with the residents, the fisherman, the homeowners, the investors, the local merchants, the pedestrians, the ORV'ers, and all the others whom this truly affects. Come up with a better compromise and please, please don't assume that the Washington-based "environmentalist" lawyers must be right.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4701    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 20:30:40  
**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 problem has been going on for much too long. It is now much past time to do this right!!

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

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

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4702    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 20:30:42  
**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:** 4703    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 20:30:42

**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:** 4704    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 20:30:42

**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:** 4705    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 20:30:42

**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.

My family and I love to visit Hatteras because it is wild and you never know what you will see there. We love to witness the grandeur of this unique place, the special climate, and seemingly limitless expanses of untamed natural beach, with no houses, hotels, or other man-made distractions.

For us, having more area dedicated as vehicle free means safety for us and our children, less worry about getting run over, and more opportunity for lots of cool critters to live and do their thing.

If we wanted to go someplace with lots of vehicles scrambling every which way, there are plenty of closer beaches for that.

Please keep as much of the national seashore beach vehicle-free as possible.

**Correspondence ID:** 4706    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 20:31:31  
**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:** 4707    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 20:31:31  
**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:** 4708    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 20:31:33  
**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:** 4709    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 20:31:33  
**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..  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4710    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 20:31:33  
**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:** 4711    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 20:31:33  
**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:** 4712    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y



**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 20:31:33  
**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:** 4713    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 20:31:41  
**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:** 4714    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 20:32:18  
**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:** 4715    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 20:32:18  
**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:** 4716    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 20:32:35  
**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:** 4717    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 20:32:35  
**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:** 4718    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 20:32:35  
**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:** 4719    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 20:32:37  
**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:** 4720    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 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:** 4721    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 20:32:58  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4722    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 20:33:00  
**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:** 4723    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 20:33:00  
**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:** 4724    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 20:33:12  
**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:** 4725    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 20:33:12  
**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:** 4726    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 20:33:39  
**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:** 4727    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.06,2010 20:33:39  
**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:** 4728    **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.  
Alternative D plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of precious wildlife and natural resources.  
The following describes the negative impact if Alternative D is not enacted:  
Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
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 the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4729    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.06,2010 20:33:39  
**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.  
I visited Cape Hatteras National Seashore a few years ago and was distressed and disheartened at the changes that had taken place over the last time I had been there 20 years earlier. Trash littered the beaches, brought in by the waves from the surrounding development, trucks were parked all around and disturbed the quiet and the view and crushed whatever shells might have been there to enjoy. This is a travesty. What is the point of going to the seashore, only to have it be ruined with the noise of engines, fumes, garbage and disturbance to the natural beauty and animals? Why has this taken place? I strongly object and request that you do anything you can to restore the seashore to one of the only pristine shores on the East Coast as it had been in 1987.  
Respectfully, Nancy Ortman

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4730    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.06,2010 20:33:46  
**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:** 4731    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 20:33:46  
**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:** 4732    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 20:33:46  
**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:** 4733    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 20:33:46  
**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:** 4734    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 20:33:46  
**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.  
It is important to protect the necessary habitat for birds and other wildlife that use these areas for breeding and nesting. We also need to track our success or necessity for further protection on an annual basis.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4735    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 20:33:54  
**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:** 4736    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 20:33:55  
**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:** 4737    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 20:33:55  
**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:** 4738    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 20:33:55

**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.

It seems that the draw of such areas is their natural beauty. ORVs may enjoy the beauty, but they destroy it for others, and quickly. Preserving the habitat as much as possible benefits every single other living thing: the pedestrians, the birdwatchers, and of course the birds and other animals on the Cape. Limiting ORV use only has a minor negative effect on a very small number of Cape users... and those users, the ORVs, are the ones least likely to appreciate it.

Thank you.

**Correspondence ID:** 4739    **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 urge you to provide more opportunity for non-motorized recreation to reduce disturbance of wildlife.

Restoration of diversity and abundance of native wildlife including birds and sea turtles is important to me.

The Park Service has erred in the past by allowing ORV use that has degraded wildlife habitats and driven away people who enjoy quiet recreation.

This is a great opportunity to eliminate or at least restrict ORV's and restore a balance. ORV's should not be permitted in areas where they conflict with current or potential habitat for native wildlife.

The current preferred alternative is unbalanced and gives a large majority of the beach to ORVs - effectively eliminating use by people who prefer quiet recreation.

I urge you to provide more access for non motorized recreationists.

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

i urge you to \* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until 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 grew up in the southeast and visited Cape Hatteras as a child a number of times. I do not remember ORV's but I do remember wind and waves and dunes and dune grasses waving in the wind. It makes me sad to learn what a poor job the park service has done in taking care of this beautiful and unique area.

Given the rampant development along the eastern seaboard it would seem that park service lands would be managed for wildlife and quiet recreation - given the great need for such management. If the Park Service does not take care of the habitat and wildlife on its lands who will?????

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

**Correspondence ID:** 4740    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 20:34:12

**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:** 4741    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 20:34:28

**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:** 4742    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 20:34:29

**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:** 4743    **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 has been a long-standing problem of largely unregulated Off-Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras. The impacts of this problem have been clear: plummeting wildlife populations; decreased access for those wishing to enjoy vehicle-free beaches; and the dominance of one user group's (ORVs) desires to trample over the interests of the majority of park visitors. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Correspondence ID:** 4744    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May.06,2010 20:34:29

**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:** 4745    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May.06,2010 20:34:30

**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.

Although my family and I are from Wisconsin, we do vacation in North Carolina to enjoy the beautiful wildlife and seashore of your state. Please do consider the above recommendations to preserve and protect your resources.

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

**Correspondence ID:** 4746    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May.06,2010 20:34:30

**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:** 4747    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 20:59:30  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I would like to briefly introduce myself. I have been visiting the Outer Banks for 35 years. I love to surf fish and most of my trips to the Outer Banks are in the fall of the year. I spend approximately 21-49 nights (3 to 7 weeks) per year at the Outer Banks, depending upon my family and business schedule. For the past 25 years, I have fished almost exclusively between Ramps 23 and 34. Therefore, since most of my Outer Banks experience is related to this location, I will confine my comments to this area.  
I would like to thank the reader of these comments for his/her time and effort. I appreciate your willingness to listen to my concerns.  
I am opposed to the closers that are suggested in Alternate F. I understand the need for some closure during the breeding season. However, I believe that corridors can be created to allow for passage of ORV's during most if not all of the breeding season. I understand some closure is needed at times, but this should be decided on an "as need" basis depending upon bird breeding locations and turtle nest locations.  
Furthermore, I am opposed to the permanent closure from Ramp 27 to Ramp 30. I see no reason for this closure. Why should this approximate 3 mile section be closed for a 12 month period? This makes no sense whatsoever to me. I am opposed to the closure for a 12 month period.  
I am also opposed to the "floating" non ORV areas as discussed in Alternate F. It seems to me that these "floating" closures are too arbitrary. I see no reason to have floating closures.  
I am opposed to the creation of new ramps between Ramp 23 and 34 as suggested by Alternate F. The new ramps and parking areas suggested are not needed and are a waste of taxpayer money. We have Ramps 23, 27, 30 and 34. Four ramps for an approximate 11 miles of beach are plenty of ramps with the parking areas now in place. We do not need new ramps in this area.  
I am also opposed to the closure of beaches to dogs during the time frames mentioned in Alternate F. I strongly agree with the use of leashes for all dogs. I think this has worked very well and in the past few years that the leash rule has been in place, I think a good solution has been reached. So, if people are allowed on the beach, then they should be allowed to bring their dog, properly managed and on a leash.  
I am opposed to the use of a "limit" to ORV's on the beaches. Keep Ramps 23-34 open, and there will be no problem with carrying capacity. Closures of the beaches create this need. However, the rule of one vehicle per 20 linear feet does suggest a reasonable approach if it is essential to having a carrying-capacity.  
I am in agreement with the speed limit changes that are suggested in Alternate F. Excellent idea and I applaud this change.  
I am in agreement with the rules and guidelines suggested in Alternate F regarding vehicle permits. I believe this will enhance education of all users.  
I would also suggest some type of education program for pedestrians in respect to walking over vegetation and the dunes. I see walkers on the beach abusing the dunes a lot. There should be more effort put forth by the park service to educate pedestrians in respect to vegetation and dunes.  
Finally, I agree with the beach closures suggested in Alternate F in respect to beaches in front of the Salvo/Waves/Rodanthe villages during tourist season. This safety measure has been in place for many years and works well. I do believe these closures should be lifted from September 15 to May 15.  
In summary, I think the beaches from Ramp 23-34 should be kept open on a year round basis with the use of corridors to route ORV's around breeding areas.  
Thank you for your time and please remember that I have limited my comments to the area of the Outer Banks in which I spend most of my time. I thought this would be the most effective way for me to comment.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4748    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 21:00:42  
**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, ORV's would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4749    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 21:00:42

**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.  
NO motorized vehicles should be allowed in any beach nesting grounds. The proper markings must be in place to warn visitors of the nesting birds. We had enough of that too in Florida, Least terns are in danger due to excessive traffic over their nesting grounds. We had made everything possible to stop the impact on this nesting birds including seasonal closures etc. Please understand the importance of these birds in our ecosystem, and the impact we are putting on their survival. Thanks.  
R. Munguia

**Correspondence ID:** 4750    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 21:00:42

**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:** 4751    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 21:00:57

**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:** 4752    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 21:00:57

**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:** 4753    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 21:00:57

**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:** 4754    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 21:00:57

**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:** 4755    **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.

As a supporter of all wildlife I would respectfully ask you to support it's preservation. These animals have only us to protect them because they do not have a voice. Orvs can ride around in countless other areas without disturbing one of the few natural habitats of these creTurea. Please give the baby birds and sea turtles a chance at life instead of allowing their murder just dor sport.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4756    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 21:01:04  
**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:** 4757    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 21:01:09  
**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:** 4758    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 21:01:11  
**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. Please consider the wildlife first.

**Correspondence ID:** 4759    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 21:01:13  
**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:** 4760    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 21:01:15  
**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:** 4761    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 21:01:15  
**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:** 4762    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 21:01:15  
**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:** 4763    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 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:** 4764    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 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:** 4765    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 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:** 4766    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 21:02:30  
**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:** 4767    **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. ORV use has clearly been identified as environmentally detrimental and this area of the outer banks, especially within the confines of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore, should be protected as a natural treasure, not a "get a little mud on the tires" type of sandbox for those with willful disregard for their natural surroundings.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at

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

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

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

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

**Correspondence ID:** 4768    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 21:02:32  
**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:** 4769    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 21:02:32  
**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.  
PLEASE PLEASE let us, as a country stop "privatizing the profits and socialize the costs." We need to put our big girl panties on and go for it....all of us, unless of course you where big boy panties. However the premise stays the same.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 4770    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 21:02:32  
**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:** 4771    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 21:02:32

**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:** 4772    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 21:03:07

**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:** 4773    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 21:03:09

**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:** 4774    **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 put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best 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:** 4775    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 21:03:11

**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:** 4776    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 21:03:11

**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.

as breeding ones.

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4777    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 21:03:53  
**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:** 4778    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 21:03:53  
**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:** 4779    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 21:03:53  
**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:** 4780    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 21:04:03  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4781    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 21:04:38  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4782    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 21:04:38  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well

as breeding ones.

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4783    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 21:04:38  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4784    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 21:04:38  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4785    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 21:04:40  
**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:** 4786    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 21:04:40  
**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:** 4787    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 21:04:44  
**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:** 4788    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 21:04:44  
**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:** 4789    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 21:05:15  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4790    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 21:05:17  
**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:** 4791    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 21:05:17  
**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:** 4792    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 21:05:19  
**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.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4793    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 21:05:19  
**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.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4794    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 21:05:20  
**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:** 4795    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 21:05:20  
**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:** 4796    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 21:16:44  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am a property owner in Kitty Hawk...we own a Jeep and have vacationed and camped in the Hatteras National Seashore Parks. We have really enjoyed the access to the beach right from the park in Hatteras. I am in favor of keeping access to Off-Road- Vehicles for the seashore areas. I believe there can be a fair balance between the need for identifying areas needing close monitoring and areas we, as tourists, can use to enjoy as we have for generations. We always respect the bird and turtle nesting areas, and have taken PRIDE in educating our children in the back seat to what that yellow tape or area is marked off for.....they now have their own ORV, both of them, and naturally stay clear of those areas because we have educated them at a young age to the purpose of respecting the natural nesting grounds ...  
In summary,,, some limited time and areas restrictions may be needed, but my family is strongly in favor of keeping access to these beautiful beaches open to ORV.  
Steve Howell 10 Coach St, Hampton, Va. 23664  
property owner: 2364 Poseidon St Kitty Hawk,NC 27949

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4797    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 21:30:42  
**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:** 4798    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 21:30:42  
**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:** 4799    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 21:30:42  
**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:** 4800    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 21:30:44  
**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:** 4801    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 21:30:49  
**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:** 4802    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 21:30:49

**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:** 4803    **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.

Alternative D, so modified, would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife. As a non-ORV user, hiker and bird-and-wildlife lover, that is extremely important to me.

Should the National Park Service choose not to enact Alternative D in its final plan, I urge the NPS to keep the following principles in mind when finalizing such plan:

-- The Cape Hatteras National Seashore is a priceless, fragile ecosystem-treasure that should be able to be enjoyed by everyone -- and most importantly, should be protected by the NPS for future generations. It is a sad fact that certain uses of the Seashore -- in particular, the use of ORV's -- are more damaging physically and ecologically than others. Moreover, ORVs present a danger to hikers, birders and pedestrians. ORV's may be fun for their riders to ride, but they offer no lasting benefit to society as a whole -- just the risk of irreparable environmental damage.

The best analogy I can provide is skateboarders' use of public spaces in Philadelphia, the city nearest me. The National Parks Service in Philly has had to contend with hugely expensive damage to benches, steps and walkways, and collisions with and injuries to passersby by skateboarders taking over these national public spaces. The skateboarders' use has unfairly made it difficult for walkers to enjoy those areas in peace.

I cannot adequately express how disturbing it is to humans -- and one can only imagine the effects on wildlife -- of loudly revving ORV engines and kicked-up sand and dune-grass. Were it up to me, I would ban them entirely from this sensitive seashore area, where we and many friends and relatives have marveled at the natural beauty of the place. But clearly, they are well-supported by the ridership, and cannot be denied a place here.

The difficulty I have with the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, is that ORVs would be allowed year-round use of all but 16 out of 68 total miles of Hatteras Seashore beach. That seems an entirely unfairly large percentage of this fragile sandbar, which the National Parks Service is charged with protecting.

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

-- Put Natural Resources First. The mandate of the NPS is to protect the nation's precious wildlife and natural landscape. Recreational use by motor-powered vehicles should certainly be considered a secondary use (if it must be allowed at all -- and many of us question that it should).

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

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

as breeding ones.

-- Above all, please keep in mind that Hatteras is a sand bar. Ever-shifting, existing at the sufferance of the ocean currents. One or more hurricanes, a few Nor'easters, and it could all be washed away. It is also a critical migration and nesting area for birds and sea-turtles. ORVs neither migrate (save on the backs of trucks and trailers) nor nest. They are not living creatures, deserving of NPS protection. They were not contemplated when the mandate for the NPS was established. They can only do damage, and only for the enjoyment of a few (i.e., their riders).

By contrast, there are thousands of acres elsewhere that are open to ORV recreation, in non-critical-habitat areas. ORV owners and riders do not need more than half of this fragile shoreline in order to have their entertainment; they can ride just as well elsewhere -- unlike the birds and sea turtles, who do not have that option for their migration or nesting.

Another example comes to mind, another place where birds stop during migration, and sea-turtles come to nest: Sanibel Island, Florida. The wise founders of the City of Sanibel enacted ordinances prohibiting free-roaming domestic pets and requiring lights-out and furniture cleared on all beaches during turtle-nesting season; they also enacted a no-powerboats-or-jetskis restriction along the Gulf beaches. As a result, visitors and residents enjoy quiet, undamaged Nature year-round. Those seeking more motorized entertainment seem to have no problem finding other places to ride. The beaches are safe, and wildlife is flourishing. Hatteras could be like this, too: or at least, more than half of it could be, with careful enactment of a plan that protects and preserves the "natural" nature of the area.

I understand the pressure you are under to continue to allow widespread use of ORVs on the Hatteras seashore; and I have no choice but to accept that a visit there means sharing the area with noisy, polluting, destructive ORVs. As a result, my family and I -- and many other nature-lovers -- have had to seek other coastal areas to birdwatch and hike.

However, for the sake of those who have loved Hatteras all their lives, and/or have no alternatives but the Hatteras seashore for enjoying those quiet pursuits, I urge you to include in the NPS plan a true balance of uses for such area, and not allow the ORVs to take over almost entirely.

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

**Correspondence ID:** 4804    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 21:30:59

**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.

Look what happened to the passenger pigeon. You can only see them stuffed now.

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

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

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

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

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

**Correspondence ID:** 4805    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 21:31:00

**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'm somewhat of a radical in my proposal that ORV's be banned from National Parks altogether. In the 1960s the NPS changed directions and began to allow and promote "recreation" in the parks with gas-powered vehicles and other products of our industrial, materialistic society. I think we should enjoy our National Parks as a refuge from the noise and pollution of most of our country.

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

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

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

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

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

**Correspondence ID:** 4806    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 21:31:00

**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:** 4807    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 21:31:10

**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:** 4808    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 21:31:10

**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:** 4809    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 21:31:12



**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.

**Correspondence ID:** 4810    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 21:31:17

**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:** 4811    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 21:31:17

**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:** 4812    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 21:31:19

**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.

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Correspondence ID:** 4813    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 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:** 4814    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 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.

A few years ago I had the opportunity to travel this beach in an SUV with some friends. I was uncomfortable the entire trip, and definitely NOT concentrating on the beach environment, because the idea of being in a vehicle seemed bizarre and basically UN-NATURAL. Although allowed by law and thus legal, it felt totally wrong to experience nature in such an artificial method.

The Alternative Plan D would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are obviously important to me, but MORE IMPORTANTLY - important for the generations to come.

Always put Natural Resources First! Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and ALL recreational use should be consistent with this protection. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan should be increased as necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

I appreciate the opportunity to provide these comments, and I will follow the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras - expecting a more balanced final plan for human visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore!

**Correspondence ID:** 4815    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 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:** 4816    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 21:31:54  
**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:** 4817    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 21:31:55  
**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:** 4818    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 21:31:55  
**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:** 4819    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 21:31:55  
**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:** 4820    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 21:31:57  
**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.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 4821    **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.  
My first assumption is that the Seashore was identified as a National Seashore because of its natural beauty and wildlife. Therefore, the preservation of that natural beauty and wildlife must come first in any plan that makes use of the Seashore.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

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

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

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

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

**Correspondence ID:** 4822    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 21:32:13

**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:** 4823    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 21:32:13

**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:** 4824    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 21:32:15

**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:** 4825    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 21:32:15

**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:** 4826    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 21:32:35

**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:** 4827    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 21:32:35

**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:** 4828    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 21:32:37

**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:** 4829    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 21:32:37

**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:** 4830    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 21:32:37

**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:** 4831    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 21:32:38

**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:** 4832    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 21:32:38

**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:** 4833    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 21:33:09

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

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

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

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



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

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

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4834    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 21:33:12  
**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:** 4835    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 21:33:13  
**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.  
Sincerely, Kathy Foulise 1757-79 ST Brooklyn, NY 11214-1613 US

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4836    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 21:33:13  
**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:** 4837    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 21:33:13

**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:** 4838    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 22:00:55

**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:** 4839    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 22:00:55

**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:** 4840    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 22:00:56

**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:** 4841    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 22:00:58

**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:** 4842    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 22:00:58

**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:** 4843    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 22:01:00

**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:** 4844    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 22:01:33

**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:** 4845    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 22:01:33

**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:** 4846    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 22:02:33

**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:** 4847    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 22:02:33

**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:** 4848    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,06,2010 22:02:33

**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.

0010178

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

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

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

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4849    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 22:02:33  
**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:** 4850    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 22:23:14  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As an avid angler on the North Carolina seashore, I am strongly opposed to the National Park Service (NPS) preferred alternative, Alternative F, in the DEIS and urge you to make significant changes to the preferred alternative in order to provide both reasonable resource protection and reasonable public access to public land. Recreational fishing is one of the most enjoyable American pastimes, and Cape Hatteras National Seashore has some of the best surf fishing locations on the east coast ? accessible only by ORV.  
Alternative F is the most restrictive management option to date, far exceeding any sense of balance between resource protection and public access and betraying all promises made to the public regarding recreational uses in the seashore. The majority of the provisions included within the preferred alternative far exceed anything proposed by a majority of the Negotiated Rulemaking Committee, including excessively large resource closures (buffers), unnecessary year-round and floating closures, and the lack of access corridors around or through resource closures.  
In order to restore balance to the DEIS, I highly recommend that the NPS revisit the proposal put forth to the Negotiated Rulemaking Committee in December of 2009. It provides the necessary protections for wildlife resources while having the support of a majority of the local community. Without reasonable ORV access, responsible anglers like me, and the local economy that is supported by recreational fishing, suffer greatly. I urge you to provide a better balance between resource protection and recreational uses by incorporating the December 2009 recommendations from the Negotiated Rulemaking Committee into the preferred alternative.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4851    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,06,2010 22:33:55  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** After waiting for 40 years we purchased a cottage in Avon, NC. We rent it in the summer and spend much time ourselves in the fall, winter and spring. We depend on the rentals to help pay for the cottage. I read with much concern that the park service had chosen to listen to special interest groups (Audubon Society) who successfully spun the tail of poor birds and turtles. Why would a department of the government attempt to restrict homeowners from enjoying the beach and surf? It is no wonder that people on the island have such contempt for the National Park Service. Who in the NPS got paid off for attempting to close the beaches to fishermen, homeowners and visitors?  
I was told this was tried 20-30 years ago and the islanders physically put a stop to such malicious intent. I can't imagine any NPS officer wanting an assignment on the outer banks.  
Please contact your management and remind them that Hatteras Island was offered because the islanders were told this would always be a recreational facility not a wildlife preserve. You folks will destroy not only the livelihood of an entire group which supports tourism, but millions of dollars in property and homes will become a wasteland. Even this administration can't be that stupid.....unless it is deliberate.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4852    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:11:55

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4853    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:11:55  
**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:** 4854    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:11:55  
**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:** 4855    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:11:55  
**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:** 4856    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:11:55  
**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:** 4857    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:12:32  
**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:** 4858    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:12:32  
**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:** 4859    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:12:32  
**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:** 4860    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:12:32  
**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:** 4861    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:12:32  
**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:** 4862    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:12:40  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4863    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
As a Travel Facilitator, Interpreter for foreign tourists to the United States, I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the 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 noise and the rubbish left behind are unacceptable and a bad environment to conduct tours with foreign tourists, who are a great and much needed and welcome source of revenue for 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.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4864    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:12:40  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this

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

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

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

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

**Correspondence ID:** 4865    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:12:40  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Correspondence ID:** 4866    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:12:40  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Correspondence ID:** 4867    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:12:40  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

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

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

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

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this

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

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

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4868    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:12:40  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.  
As a resident of California, I consider this a national issue and strongly urge the implementation of this plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4869    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:12:40  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4870    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:12:41  
**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:** 4871    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:12:50  
**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:** 4872    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:12:50  
**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:** 4873    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:12:50  
**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:** 4874    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:12:50  
**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:** 4875    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:12:51  
**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:** 4876    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:12:51  
**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:** 4877    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:12:51  
**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:** 4878    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:13:01  
**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:** 4879    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:13:11  
**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:** 4880    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:13:11  
**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:** 4881    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:13:11  
**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:** 4882    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:13:11  
**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:** 4883    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:13:18  
**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:** 4884    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:13:18  
**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:** 4885    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:13:19  
**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. Sincerely, [Glenn Marsh, 2706 Madonna Dr., Fullerton, CA, 92835

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4886    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:13:19  
**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:** 4887    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 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.  
If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors and 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.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4888    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 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. There are plenty of public beaches that offer ORV access and have few protections for wildlife- it is imperative that NPS controlled beaches, such as those at Cape Hatteras, offer the fullest protections for wildlife, while offering low impact recreation.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4889    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:13:24  
**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:** 4890    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:13:24  
**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:** 4891    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:13:24  
**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:** 4892    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:13:24  
**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:** 4893    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:13:24  
**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:** 4894    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:13:30  
**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:** 4895    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:13:31  
**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:** 4896    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:13:31  
**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:** 4897    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:13:31  
**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:** 4898    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:13:31  
**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:** 4899    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:13:32  
**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:** 4900    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:13:38  
**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:** 4901    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:13:38  
**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:** 4902    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:13:45  
**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:** 4903    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:13:46  
**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:** 4904    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 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 light of the situation in the Gulf of Mexico from the massive and yet uncontained oil spill and its potentially catastrophic effects on seabirds and turtles, even more protections are needed for these beaches. There is some risk that the oil could reach the beaches on the Atlantic.  
We also must recognize the needs for folks who need places to escape the constant daily use of motorized vehicles in our lives.  
There is an underlining assumption that these resources will be protected for wildlife and people, and weakening these protections violates the that basic premise.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4905    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:13:47  
**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:** 4906    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:13:47  
**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, as a professional biologist.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.



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

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4907    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 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 and decline of the wildlife there.  
Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife.  
Natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred 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.  
Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4908    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:13:52  
**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:** 4909    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:13:53  
**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.  
As someone who shares the coast with people and wildlife, I look for balance in public planning. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4910    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:13:53  
**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:** 4911    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:13:53  
**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:** 4912    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:13:53  
**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:** 4913    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:13:53  
**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.  
We must protect our wild life areas. ORVs do not need all 68 miles. It seems to me ORV users would want to protect certain areas for the wildlife. WE have to share this planet and more and more wilderness areas are being taken away from our 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:** 4914    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 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 is time to act. It is never the right choice to allow the destruction of life in the pursuit of fun. This is an important situation. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4915    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:13:59  
**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:** 4916    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:13:59  
**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:** 4917    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:13:59  
**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:** 4918    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:13:59  
**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:** 4919    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07.2010 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 ORV's are incompatible with wildlife. Please limit their access on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4920    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07.2010 00:14:00  
**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:** 4921    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07.2010 00:14:08  
**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:** 4922    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07.2010 00:14:08  
**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:** 4923    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,07,2010 00:14:08

**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:** 4924    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,07,2010 00:14:08

**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:** 4925    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,07,2010 00:14:08

**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:** 4926    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:14:13  
**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:** 4927    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:14:13  
**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:** 4928    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:14:13  
**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:** 4929    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:14:14  
**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:** 4930    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:14:14  
**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 and of great importance to the sustained health of our wild 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:** 4931    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:14:14  
**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:** 4932    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:14:14  
**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:** 4933    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:14:22  
**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. As one who has vacationed near Cape Hatteras National Seashore, I have firsthand knowledge of the problems this plan would address. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4934    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:14:22  
**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:** 4935    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:14:22  
**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:** 4936    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:14:22  
**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:** 4937    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:14:22  
**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:** 4938    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:14:30  
**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:** 4939    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:14:30  
**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:** 4940    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:14:30  
**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:** 4941    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:14:30  
**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:** 4942    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 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 visited your beaches and also have lived my whole life on the beaches of N.J...please protect , these beautiful creatures. This is their world too we do not own and have the right to use and destroy nature,,think about this and make the right decisions.....  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4943    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:14:38  
**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:** 4944    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,07,2010 00:14:38

**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 still remember my visit to Cape Hatterasin 1972. It was too brief. And the place we stayed was damaged by a hurricane a year or two later. But I still remember the soft-shelled crab. What a delicacy. And the long sandy islands between the coast and the sound. Of course I wouldn't be writing if I wasn't concerned about the needto protect of increasingly indangered sea turtles, rare plants and now only too often, rare birds.

Unlike the use and enjoyment of recreation vehicles, which are not in any danger of disappearing from the landscape, Ancient species of sea turtles, and plants and birds are in danger of disappearing and if they do it won't be possible to change a regulation to bring them back. You can't get an engineer to design them and put them on the ground again. Once those resources have been destroyed they are gone. So I'm writing to ask that you remain aware of your responsibility to our posterity, in making sure that your children's children will be able to share these same recources with their children in a time when we will both be gone.

**Correspondence ID:** 4945    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,07,2010 00:14:38

**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:** 4946    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,07,2010 00:14:38

**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:** 4947    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:14:39  
**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:** 4948    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:14:39  
**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:** 4949    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:14:44  
**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:** 4950    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:14:44  
**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:** 4951    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:14:44  
**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:** 4952    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:14:44  
**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:** 4953    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:14:44  
**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 OF PRIMARY IMPORTANCE to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4954    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:14:44  
**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:** 4955    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:14:44  
**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:** 4956    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:14:51  
**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:** 4957    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:14:51  
**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:** 4958    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:14:51  
**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:** 4959    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:14:51  
**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:** 4960    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:14:57  
**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:** 4961    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:14:57  
**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:** 4962    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:15:06  
**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:** 4963    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:15:06  
**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:** 4964    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:15:14  
**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:** 4965    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:15:14  
**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:** 4966    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:15:21  
**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:** 4967    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:15:21  
**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:** 4968    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:15:21  
**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:** 4969    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:15:21  
**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:** 4970    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:15:21  
**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:** 4971    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am sharing with you the comments I recently submitted on the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Off-Road Vehicle (ORV) Draft Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS).  
As an avid angler on the North Carolina seashore, I am strongly opposed to the National Park Service (NPS) preferred alternative, Alternative F, in the DEIS and urge you to make significant changes to the preferred alternative in order to provide both reasonable resource protection and reasonable public access to public land. Recreational fishing is one of the most enjoyable American pastimes, and Cape Hatteras National Seashore has some of the best surf fishing locations on the east coast - accessible only by ORV.  
Alternative F is the most restrictive management option to date, far exceeding any sense of balance between resource protection and public access and betraying all promises made to the public regarding recreational uses in the seashore. The majority of the provisions included within the preferred alternative far exceed anything proposed by a majority of the Negotiated Rulemaking Committee, including excessively large resource closures (buffers), unnecessary year-round and floating closures, and the lack of access corridors around or through resource closures.  
In order to restore balance to the DEIS, I highly recommend that the NPS revisit the proposal put forth to the Negotiated Rulemaking Committee in December of 2009. It provides the necessary protections for wildlife resources while having the support of a majority of the local community. Without reasonable ORV access, responsible anglers like me, and the local economy that is supported by recreational fishing, suffer greatly. I urge you to provide a better balance between resource protection and recreational uses by incorporating the December 2009 recommendations from the Negotiated Rulemaking Committee into the preferred alternative.  
Sincerely,  
Sonya Casner

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4972    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:42:12  
**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:** 4973    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:42:14  
**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.  
Entertainment/Recreations should not trump & jeopardize wild life. More thought should take place before enacting regulations that endanger wildlife..  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4974    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private

**Received:** May,07,2010 00:42:14

**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:** 4975    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,07,2010 00:42:14

**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:** 4976    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

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

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. As a farm forester I have learned first hand how destructive careless ORV users can be to the landscape and the plants and animals living in the area. Its outrageous that ORVs are allowed to operate within the Cape Hatteras Nat'l Seashore. This area should be for people to enjoy and not for the use of noisy, smoky thrill machines. Its time for a change!

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

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

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

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

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

**Correspondence ID:** 4977    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:42:17  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4978    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:42:17  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4979    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:42:18  
**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. I look forward to your compassionate decision on behalf of all wildlife who share this magnificent park with us and deserve to live and nest there peacefully.



---

**Correspondence ID:** 4980    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:42:18  
**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:** 4981    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:42:18  
**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:** 4982    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:42:18  
**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:** 4983    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:42:18  
**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:** 4984    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:42:24  
**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:** 4985    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:42:24  
**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:** 4986    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07.2010 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.  
Although the above is a form letter prepared by the Audubon Society it correctly and fully states my feelings and concerns regarding the Cape Hatteras National Seashore. I urge you to implement a plan which will preserve wildlife and provide recreational use for all, not just the small group of ORV riders.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4987    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07.2010 01:12:21  
**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:** 4988    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07.2010 01:12:21  
**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:** 4989    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07.2010 01:12:22  
**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:** 4990    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07.2010 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.  
Hello;  
I just received this alert from Audubon Society, and urge you to stop or manage ORV. I live in Washington state, and used to visit Cape Hatteras as a child; i am sickened to think of all the unregulated driving on the beaches. I remember Cape Hatteras as a magical and renewing place; peaceful and full of birds and wildlife. What a shame that now the beaches are full of noise, gas fumes, and machinery. That is not at all how I remember Cape Hatteras! Please protect baby birds and sea turtles; they need your protection to continue to survive. Migratory birds are having a very hard time of it. Many are becoming extinct. This doesn't have to happen. We need champions of wildlife. The comments below echo my thoughts. Please ban ORV use from the majority of the park, year round.  
I am for the alternative plan, or better still, complete banning of ORV. The jet ski problems we have in our waters seem comparable to the ORV problem, and equally as obnoxious. Let us bring our beaches and waters back to places that support and sustain wildlife FIRST, and our recreational use second! What ever happened to QUIET enjoyment of nature? Please do the right thing; advocate for those species that can't advocate for themselves and protect the fragile wildlife ecosystem.  
Thank you! Brenda Bailey \*\*\*\*\*  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4991    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07.2010 01:12:22  
**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:** 4992    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 01:42:24  
**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:** 4993    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 01:42:25  
**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:** 4994    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 01:42:25  
**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:** 4995    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 01:42:25  
**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 us.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. We will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 4996    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 01:42:29  
**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:** 4997    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 01:42:29  
**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:** 4998    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 01:42:29  
**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:** 4999    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 01:42:29  
**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:** 5000    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 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, Marco Lazzara

---



**Correspondence ID:** 5001    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 01:54:19  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Ladies and Gentlemen;

I agree the National Seashore of the Outer Banks is a national treasure and should be protected. Several years ago I was introduced to the Outer Banks area by a fellow Canadian who spent her family holidays there as a child. She remarked just how much nicer it had become and in particular, how the beaches and dunes had remained so beautiful, despite the increased human presence by way of beach houses.

As an experienced Canadian bush pilot and outdoor enthusiast, wilderness canoeist, fisherman, scuba diver and general naturalist and waterman, I was immensely impressed with the natural beauty of the OBX. And the diversity and vitality of creatures.

I was initially attracted to the area specifically to learn to kiteboard with REAL Kiteboarding. I flew down in a private aircraft with a girlfriend and enjoyed a romantic week in the now famous "Rodanthe". We enjoyed the sound, both in the water an along the edges. We explored the beach and dunes, with careful footfalls and snorkelled in the nearshore zone of the beach.

I reckon we spent seven thousand dollars that week from accomodations, to food, to instruction and sporting goods purchases. And I would bet anyone would be hard pressed to prove any detrimental impact to the National Seashore, the Pamlico Sound, the dunes, the ocean whatsoever.

As a direct result of my first trip solely for the purpose of kiteboarding, I have since returned a half dozen times in the past three years with other friends and groups. I have evangelized about kiteboarding an the wonderful business of REAL Kiteboarding to so many others around the word. I and others have enjoyed many other activities including sea kayaking, hang gliding at Kitty Hawk and simple placid days reading on the beach or shell hunting. I would say that at least twenty others have visited to learn to kiteboard. All similar to me in their respect for the ocean, the shore, the critters.

From my one trip a few years ago, the OBX has received at least \$150,000.00 in direct economic benefits from a single kiteboarder learning to kite. And I'd say with knowledge of such things and with great certainty that we have not caused any detriment to the National Shore.

I believe that such active sporting people that take advantage of the shore are the most valuable stewards. More than any Park Ranger or signage. More than a snowfence.

I think that humans are as much a part of the ecosystem as birds and fish and fauna. I think that absent deliberate and measurable damage, limiting access to the areas "just in case" really is an ignorant action based on attempt at political feel-ggod gestures rather than real science of comprehensive balance.

If nothing else, I will unreservedly state that if beach or should access is restricted in any way that would interfere with my reasonable recreational use, the area hold NO OTHER ATTRACTION for me to visit. And as such I would not return.

I think a balance of restrictions based on specific risks and consequences is reasonable. Gestures to appease the feelings of well intentioned organized so-called "environmentalists" will not satisfy them and will cause significant economic harm to the OBX.

Submitted with sincerity Robert Apenis Toronto, Canada

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5002    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 02:12:33  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

As a yearly vacationer to the Outer Banks and as a teacher of Environmental Science at Hollidaysburg Area Junior High School, I feel this alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

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

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5003    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 02:12:33  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

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

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

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

degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5004    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 02:12:33  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5005    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 02:12:33  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5006    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 02:12:33  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent

degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5007    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 02:12:35  
**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:** 5008    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 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. ORVs are a menace to wildlife, pedestrians, and themselves! There are plenty of other areas where the delicate balance of nature would not be as severely impacted by their use.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species.  
\* 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:** 5009    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 02:42:25  
**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:** 5010    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07.2010 02:42:28  
**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:** 5011    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07.2010 02:42:28  
**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:** 5012    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07.2010 02:42:28  
**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:** 5013    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Grego, John M  
**Received:** May.07.2010 03:02:52  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
 I would like to support Alternative D in the Draft ORV Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement. Under the Organic Act, the park system should protect natural resources while providing for public enjoyment; it has always been understood that resource protection is the higher priority. Alternative F (and other alternatives) defer to ORV users at the expense of shorebirds and other users. I'm particularly concerned that migrating shorebirds in the winter receive so little consideration from the park service in their preferred plan. The seashore needs more year-round restrictions on ORV use to protect shorebirds not just during breeding season, but during migration and over-wintering as well.  
 Sincerely, John Grego

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5014    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07.2010 03:10:12  
**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:** 5015    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07.2010 03:10:12  
**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:** 5016    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07.2010 03:12:21  
**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:** 5017    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 03:12:21  
**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:** 5018    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 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 IN AGREEMENT WITH THE NEED FOR PUTTING WILDLIFE FIRST IN CONSIDERATION OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF A MANAGEMENT PLAN FOR CAPE HATTERAS NATIONAL SEASHORE. VISITORS FACILITIES FOR PASSIVE RECREATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES THAT ARE LESS INVASIVE ON THE WILDLIFE POPULATION ARE ACCEPTABLE. IF NECESSARY LIMITED, REGULATED ATV USAGE COULD BE ALLOWED BUT I WONDER ABOUT ATVS IMPACT ON THE SAND SHARING SYSTEM. WE, AMERICANS MUST REALIZE THAT THE TIME IS HERE FOR STRONG PROTECTION OF OUR NATURAL RESOURCES EVEN AT THE EXPENSE OF SOME CITIZENS' CHOIC OF RECREATIONAL PLEASURE. dale thorpe  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5019    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 03:12:21  
**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:** 5020    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 03:12:21  
**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:** 5021    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 03:12:21  
**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:** 5022    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 03:39:11  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** The National Park Service has done a great job of protecting NC's outer banks against development from Cape Lookout to Cape Hatteras. This job was done by simply maintaining ownership of the land and not allowing it to become the Condo Coast. NPS focus should remain here and not transition into more of a regulatory role by restricting access. This land is collectively "Our Land" and every citizen and visitor of this great nation should have full access to it.

**Correspondence ID:** 5023    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 03:39:50  
**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:** 5024    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May.07.2010 03:39:50

**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:** 5025    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May.07.2010 03:39:50

**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:** 5026    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May.07.2010 03:39:50

**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:** 5027    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 03:39:50  
**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:** 5028    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 03:39:50  
**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:** 5029    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am writing this email to take advantage of 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: Alternative F is unfairly balanced in favor of off road vehicles. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until 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:** 5030    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 03:39:55  
**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:** 5031    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 03:39:56  
**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:** 5032    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 03:39:56  
**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:** 5033    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 03:39:56  
**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:** 5034    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07.2010 03:40:01  
**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:** 5035    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07.2010 03:40:01  
**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:** 5036    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07.2010 03:40:01  
**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:** 5037    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 03:40:01  
**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:** 5038    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 03:40:01  
**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:** 5039    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 03:40:01  
**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 principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until 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:** 5040    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 03:40:01

**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:** 5041 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y**Name:** private**Received:** May,07,2010 03:40:07**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. Please help protect our wildlife and our coast. Between the natural disasters and "man-made" poor decisions, we are already losing so much of our "nature-al" surroundings.

**Correspondence ID:** 5042 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y**Name:** private**Received:** May,07,2010 03:40:07**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:** 5043 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y**Name:** private**Received:** May,07,2010 03:40:09**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:** 5044    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 03:40:09  
**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:** 5045    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 03:40:09  
**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:** 5046    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 03:40:09  
**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:** 5047    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07.2010 03:40:09  
**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:** 5048    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07.2010 03:40:10  
**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:** 5049    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07.2010 03:40:10  
**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:** 5050    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07.2010 03:40:10  
**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:** 5051    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 03:40:17  
**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:** 5052    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 03:40:21  
**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:** 5053    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 03:40:21  
**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:** 5054    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 03:40:21  
**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:** 5055    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 03:40:21  
**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:** 5056    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 03:40:21  
**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:** 5057    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 03:42:26  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5058    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 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:** 5059    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 03:42:26  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5060    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 04:10:06  
**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:** 5061    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 04:10:06  
**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:** 5062    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 04:10:06  
**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:** 5063    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 04:10:06  
**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:** 5064    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 04:10:06  
**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:** 5065    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 04:10:06  
**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:** 5066    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 04:10:06  
**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:** 5067    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 04:10:06  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I see no reason why ORVs should be operated on the National Sea Shore. The park has been established as a protection to nature. What possible reason could there be to run loud and destructive motorized vehicles within the park?

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5068    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 04:10:07

**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:** 5069 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y**Name:** private**Received:** May,07,2010 04:10:12**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:** 5070 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y**Name:** private**Received:** May,07,2010 04:10:12**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:** 5071 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y**Name:** private**Received:** May,07,2010 04:10:12**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:** 5072    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 04:10:13  
**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. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until 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:** 5073    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 04:10:13  
**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:** 5074    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 04:10:13  
**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:** 5075    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 04:10:18  
**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:** 5076    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 04:10:19  
**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:** 5077    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 04:10:19  
**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:** 5078    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 04:10:19  
**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:** 5079    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 04:10:20

**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:** 5080    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 04:10:20

**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:** 5081    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 04:10:20

**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:** 5082    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 04:10:31  
**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:** 5083    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 04:10:31  
**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:** 5084    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 04:10:32  
**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:** 5085    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 04:10:33  
**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:** 5086    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 04:10:33  
**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:** 5087    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 04:10:36  
**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:** 5088    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 04:10:41  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As a 30-year career professional at NPS, now retired, 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:** 5089    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 04:10:42  
**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:** 5090    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 04:10:42  
**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:** 5091    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 04:10:42  
**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:** 5092    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07.2010 04:12:27  
**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.  
 I support the alternative plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras. There are many ways and places for us to have recreation, including ORVs, where endangered species are not put further into peril.  
 There is only one piping plover.  
 Thanks for YOUR support.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5093    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07.2010 04:12:27  
**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:** 5094    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07.2010 04:12:27  
**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:** 5095    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** West, Karen C  
**Received:** May.07.2010 04:21:52  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As an avid angler on the North Carolina seashore, I am strongly opposed to the National Park Service (NPS) preferred alternative, Alternative F, in the DEIS and urge you to make significant changes to the preferred alternative in order to provide both reasonable resource protection and reasonable public access to public land. Recreational fishing is one of the most enjoyable American pastimes, and Cape Hatteras National Seashore has some of the best surf fishing locations on the east coast ? accessible only by ORV.

Alternative F is the most restrictive management option to date, far exceeding any sense of balance between resource protection and public access and betraying all promises made to the public regarding recreational uses in the seashore. The majority of the provisions included within the preferred alternative far exceed anything proposed by a majority of the Negotiated Rulemaking Committee, including excessively large resource closures (buffers), unnecessary year-round and floating closures, and the lack of access corridors around or through resource closures.

In order to restore balance to the DEIS, I highly recommend that the NPS revisit the proposal put forth to the Negotiated Rulemaking Committee in December of 2009. It provides the necessary protections for wildlife resources while having the support of a majority of the local community. Without reasonable ORV access, responsible anglers like me, and the local economy that is supported by recreational fishing, suffer greatly. I urge you to provide a better balance between resource protection and recreational uses by incorporating the December 2009 recommendations from the Negotiated Rulemaking Committee into the preferred alternative.

Sincerely,  
Karen C. West

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5096    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 04:23:11  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As an avid angler on the North Carolina seashore, I am strongly opposed to the National Park Service (NPS) preferred alternative, Alternative F, in the DEIS and urge you to make significant changes to the preferred alternative in order to provide both reasonable resource protection and reasonable public access to public land. Recreational fishing is one of the most enjoyable American pastimes, and Cape Hatteras National Seashore has some of the best surf fishing locations on the east coast ? accessible only by ORV.  
Alternative F is the most restrictive management option to date, far exceeding any sense of balance between resource protection and public access and betraying all promises made to the public regarding recreational uses in the seashore. The majority of the provisions included within the preferred alternative far exceed anything proposed by a majority of the Negotiated Rulemaking Committee, including excessively large resource closures (buffers), unnecessary year-round and floating closures, and the lack of access corridors around or through resource closures.  
In order to restore balance to the DEIS, I highly recommend that the NPS revisit the proposal put forth to the Negotiated Rulemaking Committee in December of 2009. It provides the necessary protections for wildlife resources while having the support of a majority of the local community. Without reasonable ORV access, responsible anglers like me, and the local economy that is supported by recreational fishing, suffer greatly. I urge you to provide a better balance between resource protection and recreational uses by incorporating the December 2009 recommendations from the Negotiated Rulemaking Committee into the preferred alternative.  
Sincerely,  
Danny L. West

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5097    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 04:24:29  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As an avid angler on the North Carolina seashore, I am strongly opposed to the National Park Service (NPS) preferred alternative, Alternative F, in the DEIS and urge you to make significant changes to the preferred alternative in order to provide both reasonable resource protection and reasonable public access to public land. Recreational fishing is one of the most enjoyable American pastimes, and Cape Hatteras National Seashore has some of the best surf fishing locations on the east coast ? accessible only by ORV.  
Alternative F is the most restrictive management option to date, far exceeding any sense of balance between resource protection and public access and betraying all promises made to the public regarding recreational uses in the seashore. The majority of the provisions included within the preferred alternative far exceed anything proposed by a majority of the Negotiated Rulemaking Committee, including excessively large resource closures (buffers), unnecessary year-round and floating closures, and the lack of access corridors around or through resource closures.  
In order to restore balance to the DEIS, I highly recommend that the NPS revisit the proposal put forth to the Negotiated Rulemaking Committee in December of 2009. It provides the necessary protections for wildlife resources while having the support of a majority of the local community. Without reasonable ORV access, responsible anglers like me, and the local economy that is supported by recreational fishing, suffer greatly. I urge you to provide a better balance between resource protection and recreational uses by incorporating the December 2009 recommendations from the Negotiated Rulemaking Committee into the preferred alternative.  
Sincerely,  
Corben R. West

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5098    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 04:24:29  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** It continues to amaze me that there is a continued push to ban Kiteboarding in certain areas. Although I have not been to Cape Hatteras, I am planning a kiteboarding trip there for this fall. It is a rather large boom for tourism. I understand the environmental concerns, but this is a fossil fuel free pastime. Water skiing, wakeboarding, downhill skiing all use up fossil fuels. Banning kiteboarding for these reasons would be like banning snow shoeing or cross country skiing in the Northern States because you might scare the bunny rabbits. Let's keep perspective on the situation and look to the current crisis in the Gulf of Mexico and be concerned with finding activities that reduce the use of fossil fuels.  
Todd Barlow

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5099    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 04:25:18  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As an avid angler on the North Carolina seashore, I am strongly opposed to the National Park Service (NPS) preferred alternative, Alternative F, in the DEIS and urge you to make significant changes to the preferred alternative in order to provide both reasonable resource protection and reasonable public access to public land. Recreational fishing is one of the most enjoyable American pastimes, and Cape Hatteras National Seashore has some of the best surf fishing locations on the east coast ? accessible only by ORV.  
Alternative F is the most restrictive management option to date, far exceeding any sense of balance between resource protection and public access and betraying all promises made to the public regarding recreational uses in the seashore. The majority of the provisions included within the preferred alternative far exceed anything proposed by a majority of the Negotiated Rulemaking Committee, including excessively large resource closures (buffers), unnecessary year-round and floating closures, and the lack of access corridors around or through resource closures.  
In order to restore balance to the DEIS, I highly recommend that the NPS revisit the proposal put forth to the Negotiated Rulemaking Committee in December of 2009. It provides the necessary protections for wildlife resources while having the support of a majority of the local community. Without reasonable ORV access, responsible anglers like me, and the local economy that is supported by recreational fishing, suffer greatly. I urge you to provide a better balance between resource protection and recreational uses by incorporating the December 2009 recommendations from the Negotiated Rulemaking Committee into the preferred alternative.  
Sincerely,

Cody R. West

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5100	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596		
<b>Name:</b>	Chumley, Nancy						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 04:25:50						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I agree with the Dare County DEIS Position Statement. I believe that this would be an equitable solution which will preserve both wildlife and beach access and recreation for everyone in the Cape Hatteras National Seashore.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5101	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 04:39:53						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>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.</p> <p>The following principals 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>						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5102	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 04:39:53						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>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.</p> <p>The following principals 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>						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5103	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 04:39:53						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>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.</p> <p>The following principals 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>						

**Correspondence ID:** 5104    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 04:39:53  
**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:** 5105    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 04:39:54  
**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:** 5106    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 04:39:54  
**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:** 5107    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 04:39:54  
**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:** 5108    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 04:40:00  
**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:** 5109    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 04:40:00  
**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:** 5110    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 04:40:00  
**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:** 5111    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 04:40:00  
**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:** 5112    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 04:40:00  
**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. Please Help!!!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5113    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 04:40:00  
**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:** 5114    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private

**Received:** May,07,2010 04:40:05  
**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:** 5115    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 04:40:05  
**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:** 5116    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 04:40:06  
**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:** 5117    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 04:40:06  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** While this is a 'form letter', it expresses my opinion exactly. I hope that ORVs will be contained, so as to allow the wildlife, and the visitors some peace! 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:** 5118    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 04:40:06  
**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:** 5119    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 04:40:06  
**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:** 5120    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 04:40:12  
**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. I personally feel that ORV should be banned from National Parks, Reserves and Seashores altogether. We have enough vehicles everywhere else, we don't need them spoiling the peace while we try to enjoy the birds.  
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:** 5121    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 04:40:12  
**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:** 5122    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 04:40:13  
**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:** 5123    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 04:40:13  
**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:** 5124    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 04:40:13

**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:** 5125    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y**Name:** private**Received:** May,07,2010 04:40:18**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:** 5126    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y**Name:** private**Received:** May,07,2010 04:40:18**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:** 5127    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y**Name:** private**Received:** May,07,2010 04:40:18**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:** 5128    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 04:40:18  
**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. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until 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:** 5129    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 04:40:19  
**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:** 5130    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 04:40:19  
**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:** 5131    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 04:40:24  
**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:** 5132    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Thank you for allowing me to express my opposition to favoring ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. When we have a choice to favor wildlife and the environment, or to favor something man-created, like ORV, we should favor wildlife. This is why national parks were created in the first place - to set aside, protect, and preserve some of the beautiful places that our country has to offer. To enjoy the natural world, not to drown it out and roll over it and slowly destroy it.  
Man-made creations take their toll against wildlife and the environment when there isn't a choice and cause destruction and, sometimes, irreversible damage.  
It doesn't make sense to allow vehicles to come enjoy the beauty that nature provides on the shores there, when the very act of allowing the vehicles will chip away at and ultimately kill off what they came to see. At least allow equal access to non-ORV  
. 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:** 5133    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 04:42:33  
**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:** 5134    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 04:42:33  
**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:** 5135    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 04:42:33  
**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:** 5136    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 04:42:33  
**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.



as breeding ones.

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5137    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07.2010 04:42:46  
**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:** 5138    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Doerr, James E  
**Received:** May.07.2010 04:46:31  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As an out of state visitor to the Cape Hatteras National Seashore on a near yearly basis since 1984, it troubles me to read of the current overly restrictive regulations limiting beach access. When my family and I travel to the Outer Banks, we do so to enjoy the great outdoors with fishing being our primary objective. Each visit we make we infuse several thousand dollars into the local business community including expenditures for motel/house rental, fishing charters, restaurant and grocery store food, tackle shop purchases and general shopping. Without the ability to access the beach for fishing and general enjoyment, our future visits to the Outer Banks will certainly be reduced in number if not for the most part eliminated as there are plenty of other fishing vacation options much closer to our Ohio home.  
As such, I am in favor of the beach access regulation modifications being currently recommended by Dare Co. I believe that their recommendations provide a well thoughtout and reasonable compromise to the current overly restrictive regulations.  
Thank you for your consideration. Jim Doerr Akron, Ohio

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5139    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07.2010 05:09:56  
**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:** 5140    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07.2010 05:09:56  
**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:** 5141    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 05:09:56  
**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:** 5142    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 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. The only ORV's that should be running around that park are the trained Rangers that are trained and employed by the park. I know first hand that zipping around on a quad is much fun. However, there is a time and place for everything. This is not wildlife wandering on to roads or highways, becoming roadkill. It is akin to being killed in your own living room!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5143    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 05:09:56  
**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:** 5144    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 05:09:56  
**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:** 5145    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 05:10:01  
**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:** 5146    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 05:10:01  
**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:** 5147    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 05:10:01  
**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:** 5148    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 05:10:01  
**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:** 5149    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 05:10:01  
**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:** 5150    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 05:10:02  
**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:** 5151    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 05:10:07  
**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:** 5152    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 05:10:07  
**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:** 5153    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 05:10:07  
**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:** 5154    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07.2010 05:10:07  
**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:** 5155    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07.2010 05:10:07  
**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:** 5156    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07.2010 05:10:08  
**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:** 5157    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07.2010 05:10:08  
**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:** 5158    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07,2010 05:10:08  
**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:** 5159    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07,2010 05:10:08  
**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:** 5160    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07,2010 05:10:08  
**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:** 5161    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 05:10:13  
**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:** 5162    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 05:10:13  
**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:** 5163    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 05:10:13  
**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:** 5164    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y



**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 05:10:13  
**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:** 5165    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 05:10:13  
**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:** 5166    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 05:10:14  
**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:** 5167    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 05:10:19  
**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:** 5168    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 05:10:20  
**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:** 5169    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 05:10:20  
**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:** 5170    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 05:10:20  
**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:** 5171    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 05:10:20  
**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:** 5172    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 05:10:20  
**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:** 5173    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 05:10:20  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** With the extinction of the wildlife in the Gulf of Mexico, it has become imperative to protect and nurture the aquatic life forms along the Atlantic coastline. The nation is depending on you to preserve our biodiversity and our heritage.  
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:** 5174    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private

**Received:** May,07,2010 05:10:20  
**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:** 5175    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 05:10:20  
**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:** 5176    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 05:10:25  
**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:** 5177    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 05:10:25  
**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:** 5178    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 05:10:25  
**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:** 5179    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 05:10:25  
**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:** 5180    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 05:10:25  
**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:** 5181    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 05:10:25  
**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:** 5182    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 05:10:31  
**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:** 5183    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 05:10:31  
**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:** 5184    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 05:10:31  
**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:** 5185    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 05:10:31  
**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:** 5186    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 05:10:31  
**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:** 5187    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 05:10:31  
**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:** 5188    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 05:10:36  
**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:** 5189    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 05:10:36  
**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:** 5190    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 05:10:36  
**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:** 5191    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 05:10:36  
**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:** 5192    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 05:10:36  
**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:** 5193    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 05:10:36  
**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:** 5194    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 05:10:36  
**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:** 5195    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 05:10:42  
**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:** 5196    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 05:10:42  
**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:** 5197    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 05:10:42  
**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:** 5198    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 05:10:42  
**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:** 5199    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 05:10:42  
**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:** 5200    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 05:10:42  
**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:** 5201    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private

**Received:** May,07,2010 05:10:47  
**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:** 5202    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 05:10:47  
**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:** 5203    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 05:10:47  
**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:** 5204    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 05:10:47  
**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:** 5205    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 05:12:34  
**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:** 5206    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 05:12:34  
**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:** 5207    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 05:12:34  
**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:** 5208    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 05:12:37  
**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:** 5209    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 05:12:41  
**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:** 5210    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 05:12:41  
**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:** 5211    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07.2010 05:12:42  
**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:** 5212    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07.2010 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 to Cape Hatteras many times, and the Outer Banks is one of my favorite vacation spots. The main appeal of Cape Hatteras is the beautiful, un-touched natural  
There are many other places people can use ORVs (Trust me-- MANY other places). Why people absolutely must use National Park land and nesting ground to do this, I have no idea. Please do not give in to them. The new plans are SUPPORTED.  
The alternative plan mentioned earlier in my letter would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5213    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07.2010 05:12:42  
**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:** 5214    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,07,2010 05:12:44

**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:** 5215    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,07,2010 05:12:47

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Correspondence ID:** 5216    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

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

**Received:** May,07,2010 05:26:20

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Cape Hatteras National Seashore ( Recreational Area ) should be accessible 24 hours a day seven days a week 365 days a year The main use of the beach is fishing, the preferred means of access is by ORV. Night fishing and camp fires is a means of family bonding that has past generation to generation. There is no reasonable scientific proof that any wildlife cannot coexist with humans and ORVs. I need unrestricted access to those points and spits for one week a year to refresh my soul. Limitations currently in force have caused my family to do without our "Beach Fix" for two years now. Please, Please, revert back to the the previous regulations that were in place prior to the Consent Decree and make a stand for the people against the big Nationally funded animal rights groups/lobbists who appear to be running the park service.



**Correspondence ID:** 5217    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 05:39:58  
**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:** 5218    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 05:39:58  
**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:** 5219    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 05:39:58  
**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:** 5220    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 05:39:58  
**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:** 5221    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 05:39:58  
**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:** 5222    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 05:40:05  
**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:** 5223    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 05:40:06  
**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:** 5224    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 05:40:07  
**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:** 5225    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 05:40:07  
**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:** 5226    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 05:40:07  
**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:** 5227    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private

**Received:** May,07,2010 05:40:07  
**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:** 5228    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 05:40:14  
**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:** 5229    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 05:40:14  
**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:** 5230    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 05:40:14  
**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:** 5231    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 05:40:14  
**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:** 5232    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 05:40:16  
**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:** 5233    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 05:40:16  
**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:** 5234    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 05:40:16  
**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:** 5235    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 05:40:21  
**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:** 5236    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 05:40:21  
**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:** 5237    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 05:40:21  
**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:** 5238    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 05:40:21  
**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:** 5239    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 05:40:21  
**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:** 5240    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 05:40:21  
**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:** 5241    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 05:40:21  
**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:** 5242    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 05:40:22  
**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:** 5243    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 05:40:27  
**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:** 5244    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 05:40:27  
**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:** 5245    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 05:40:27  
**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:** 5246    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 05:40:27  
**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:** 5247    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 05:40:27  
**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:** 5248    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 05:40:27  
**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:** 5249    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 05:40:27  
**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:** 5250    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 05:40:32  
**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:** 5251    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 05:40:32  
**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:** 5252    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 05:40:32  
**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:** 5253    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 05:40:32  
**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:** 5254    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private

**Received:** May,07,2010 05:40:32  
**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:** 5255    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 05:40:33  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Mgmt, 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:** 5256    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 05:40:37  
**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:** 5257    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 05:40:37  
**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:** 5258    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 05:40:38  
**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.  
In the end, heavy use by off road vehicles is not compatible with conservation or parkland. There are suitable places for these things and this isn't one of them.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5259    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 05:40:38  
**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:** 5260    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 05:40:38  
**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:** 5261    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 05:40:43  
**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:** 5262    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 05:40:43  
**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:** 5263    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 05:40:43  
**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:** 5264    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 05:40:43

**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:** 5265    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,07,2010 05:40:43

**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:** 5266    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,07,2010 05:40:43

**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:** 5267    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,07,2010 05:40:48

**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:** 5268    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 05:40:48  
**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. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until 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:** 5269    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 05:40:48  
**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:** 5270    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 05:40:48  
**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:** 5271    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 05:40:48  
**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:** 5272    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 05:40:48  
**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:** 5273    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 05:40:49  
**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:** 5274    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 05:40:49  
**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:** 5275    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 05:40:54  
**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:** 5276    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 05:40:54  
**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:** 5277    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 05:40:54  
**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:** 5278    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 05:40:54  
**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:** 5279    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 05:40:54  
**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:** 5280    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 05:40:54  
**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:** 5281    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 05:40:54  
**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:** 5282    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 05:40:59  
**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:** 5283    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 05:40:59  
**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:** 5284    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 05:40:59  
**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:** 5285    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07.2010 05:40:59  
**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:** 5286    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07.2010 05:40:59  
**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:** 5287    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07.2010 05:40:59  
**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:** 5288    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 05:40:59  
**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:** 5289    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 05:40:59  
**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:** 5290    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 05:40:59  
**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:** 5291    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 05:41:04

**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:** 5292    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,07,2010 05:41:04

**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:** 5293    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am a homeowner in Frisco and Hatteras, NC. My vacation home in Frisco backs up to the Cape Hatteras National Seashore and Recreation Area. I am also an avid fisherman, both on shore and off shore. My family has enjoyed the beauty and outdoor activities at the Cape Hatteras National Seashore and Recreation Area for many years. Over the past several years, I have become concerned that the future direction of this national treasure is being manipulated by special interest groups. I want to provide my views as a concerned citizen.

As an avid angler and homeowner on the North Carolina seashore, I am strongly opposed to the National Park Service (NPS) preferred alternative, Alternative F, in the DEIS and urge you to make significant changes to the preferred alternative in order to provide both reasonable resource protection and reasonable public access to public land. Recreational fishing is one of the most enjoyable American pastimes, and Cape Hatteras National Seashore and Recreation Area has some of the best surf fishing locations on the east coast ? accessible only by ORV.

Alternative F is the most restrictive management option to date, far exceeding any sense of balance between resource protection and public access and betraying all promises made to the public regarding recreational uses in the seashore. The majority of the provisions included within the preferred alternative far exceed anything proposed by a majority of the Negotiated Rulemaking Committee, including excessively large resource closures (buffers), unnecessary year-round and floating closures, and the lack of access corridors around or through resource closures.

In order to restore balance to the DEIS, I highly recommend that the NPS revisit the proposal put forth to the Negotiated Rulemaking Committee in December of 2009. It provides the necessary protections for wildlife resources while having the support of a majority of the local community. Without reasonable ORV access, responsible anglers like me, and the local economy that is supported by recreational fishing, suffer greatly. As a homeowner in Frisco and Hatteras, I urge you to provide a better balance between resource protection and recreational uses by incorporating the December 2009 recommendations from the Negotiated Rulemaking Committee into the preferred alternative.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5294    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,07,2010 05:42:39

**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:** 5295    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,07,2010 05:42:39

**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:** 5296    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,07,2010 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 would be very happy if ORV were banned completely in the interest of the environment, and public health. People should be exercising by walking, not ripping around in ORV's disturbing other people and doing great harm to the natural wildlife.

These ORV users are rude, inconsiderate, and tend to disregard rules. They litter the beaches with trash, create noise pollution, add to emissions, and leave deep ruts killing turtle eggs and bird eggs.

On top of that, ORV's are unsafe, and unhealthy. Too many kids end up with serious injuries. They should not be allowed in any parks or recreational areas.

I would appreciate any feedback you'd like to provide on this issue. I hope that you will show us that you truly care about the environment.

**Correspondence ID:** 5297    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,07,2010 05:42:39

**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:** 5298    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 05:42:39  
**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:** 5299    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 05:42:39  
**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:** 5300    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 05:42:48  
**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.

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5301	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 05:42:48						
<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>	5302	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 05:59:01						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Save HATTERAS						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5303	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 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>	5304	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 06:10:02						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>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.</p> <p>The following principals 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>						

**Correspondence ID:** 5305    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:10:02  
**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:** 5306    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:10:02  
**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:** 5307    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:10:02  
**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:** 5308    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:10:02  
**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:** 5309    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:10:02  
**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:** 5310    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:10:07  
**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:** 5311    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:10:07  
**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:** 5312    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:10:07  
**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:** 5313    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:10:07  
**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:** 5314    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:10:08  
**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:** 5315    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private

**Received:** May,07,2010 06:10:08  
**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:** 5316    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:10:08  
**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:** 5317    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:10:08  
**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:** 5318    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:10:13  
**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:** 5319    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:10:13  
**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:** 5320    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:10:13  
**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:** 5321    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:10:13  
**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:** 5322    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:10:13  
**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:** 5323    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:10:13  
**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:** 5324    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am an off-roader myself and have taken my Jeep on the beaches of Hatteras. I am strongly IN FAVOR of limiting ORV's and of imposing strict guidelines. My fun and adventure can be responsible and we must do something to enforce the protection of these species.  
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best 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:** 5325    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:10:18  
**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:** 5326    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:10:18  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Thank you for 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. Our custodial role of the environment requires that we protect wildlife.  
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:** 5327    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:10:18  
**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:** 5328    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:10:19  
**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:** 5329    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:10:19

**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:** 5330    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private**Received:** May,07,2010 06:10:19**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:** 5331    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private**Received:** May,07,2010 06:10:19**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:** 5332    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private**Received:** May,07,2010 06:10:19**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:** 5333    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:10:24  
**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. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until 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:** 5334    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:10:24  
**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:** 5335    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:10:24  
**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:** 5336    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:10:24  
**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.  
While I am a great fan of surf fishing I would not drive in area's that would endanger the welfare of animals.  
Those nesting area's should be off limits to off road vehicles.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5337    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:10:24  
**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:** 5338    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:10:24  
**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:** 5339    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:10:29  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** The Cape Hatteras National Seashore is especially important to me. I grew up on the Outer Banks. There is so little beach left that isn't built on and the wild life is threatened at every turn.

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:** 5340    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:10:29  
**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:** 5341    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:10:29  
**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:** 5342    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:10:29  
**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:** 5343    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:10:29  
**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:** 5344    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:10:29  
**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:** 5345    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:10:34  
**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:** 5346    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:10:34  
**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:** 5347    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:10:35  
**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:** 5348    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:10:35  
**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:** 5349    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:10:35  
**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:** 5350    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:10:35  
**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:** 5351    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:10:41  
**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:** 5352    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:10:41  
**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:** 5353    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:10:41  
**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:** 5354    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:10:41  
**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:** 5355    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:10:41  
**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:** 5356    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:10:45  
**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:** 5357    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:10:45  
**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:** 5358    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:10:45  
**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:** 5359    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:10:45  
**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:** 5360    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:10:45  
**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:** 5361    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:10:50  
**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:** 5362    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:10:50  
**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:** 5363    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:10:51  
**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:** 5364    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:10:51  
**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:** 5365    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:10:51  
**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:** 5366    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private

**Received:** May,07,2010 06:10:51  
**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:** 5367    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:10:56  
**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:** 5368    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:10:56  
**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:** 5369    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:10:56  
**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:** 5370    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am writing this letter to beg you to pay attention to our need to honor and preserve our wildlife habitats. In this instance the use of ORV is highly intrusive due to fumes, noise, and extended remote area access. Give the wildlife and other people a place to peacefully and happily enjoy the beautiful sanctuary that nature has provided. For some, the use of ORVs (also used for hunting) stimulates a desire to race and play rough and hard. I do appreciate this 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. Thank You

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5371    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:10:56  
**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:** 5372    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:10:56  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I'm just home from a week on a North Carolina beach (Topsail). I spend a couple of weeks there every year--bird watching mostly, although I always stop by the turtle hospita, too. N C beaches offer an amazing range of wildlife which I hope the state's residents treasure.

Now 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:** 5373    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:11:01  
**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:** 5374    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 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.  
My family loves to vacation on Hatteras' shores, and would be devastated by the long-term effects of neglect of the natural wildlife that chooses to make these shores their home if action were not taken to protect their environment. Sacrifice from those in power enable the ones who cannot protect themselves an existence they deserve. Please do the right thing.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5375    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:11:01  
**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:** 5376    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:11:01  
**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.  
Thank you and God Bless.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5377    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:11:01  
**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:** 5378    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:11:01  
**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:** 5379    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:11:01  
**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:** 5380    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:11:03  
**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:** 5381    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 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.  
The use of the area year-around by wildlife is extremely important to me. Keep ORV and pedestrians away from probable nesting areas (i.e., habitat suitable for nesting by sea turtles and birds) during potential nesting times and migrations during the year. This is vitally important at all hours of the day.  
Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5382    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:11:07  
**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:** 5383    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:11:07  
**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:** 5384    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:11:07  
**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:** 5385    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:11:07  
**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. PLEASE DO THE RIGHT AND RESPONSIBLE THING BY ENACTING RESTRICTIONS THAT WILL PROTECT THE WILDLIFE IN THESE WILD AREAS. ONCE WE LOSE OUR PRECIOUS RESOURCES, THEY CAN NEVER BE RECOVERED.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5386    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:11:07  
**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:** 5387    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:11:13  
**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:** 5388    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:11:13  
**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:** 5389    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:11:13

**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:** 5390    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:11:13  
**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:** 5391    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:11:13  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please institute a plan to decrease ATV usage in the Hatteras National Seashore area.

Perhaps there could be some way developed to transport fishermen to and from their fishing areas in a responsible way, rather than permitting each person or persons to travel there in their own vehicle. This would go far toward satisfying both the fishermen and those concerned with safeguards for the nesting areas of threatened species.

Thank you very much for your consideration.  
 Jerry and Bonnie Whitmire Pittsboro, North Carolina

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5392    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:11:13  
**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:** 5393    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 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.  
Please consider that "whatever befalls the Earth, befalls the Sons of the Earth." We have one world. We must take care of it! As a North Carolinian and a great lover of the Outer Banks, I urge you to conserve our coast land! There is so much beauty and history at the Outer Banks. Please don't allow the destruction of this precious area!  
Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5394    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:11:19  
**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:** 5395    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As a native of Western N.C., and occasional visitor to our East Coast Outer Banks, I am very aware of the importance to do everything possible to preserve, protect and maintain our increasingly human-threatened natural environment. Thus, I appreciate the opportunity to comment on, and support, the National Park Service's 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.  
While I would encourage the extreme of a total banning of ORV on the fragile sand barrier island beaches, at least the following minimal 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:** 5396    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:11:19

**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:** 5397    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:12:41  
**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:** 5398    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:12:41  
**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:** 5399    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:12:41  
**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:** 5400    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:12:42  
**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:** 5401    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:12:42  
**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, as a birder, are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until 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 stop giving in to the rabid and insensible nutters that make up the ORV lobby.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 5402    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:12:42  
**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:** 5403    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,07,2010 06:12:52

**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:** 5404    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,07,2010 06:12:52

**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:** 5405    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,07,2010 06:12:52

**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:** 5406    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07,2010 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 underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. \* Put Natural Resources First. \* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery.  
Thank you .

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5407    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07,2010 06:12:52  
**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:** 5408    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07,2010 06:12:52  
**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:** 5409    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:12:59  
**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:** 5410    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:12:59  
**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:** 5411    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:13:05  
**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:** 5412    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:13:06  
**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:** 5413    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:13:06  
**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:** 5414    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:13:06  
**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:** 5415    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07,2010 06:13:06  
**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:** 5416    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07,2010 06:13:06  
**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:** 5417    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07,2010 06:13:06  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
I believe we can protect our national parks and still allow public land for recreational purposes -- perhaps not in our national parks but on other land, specifically designated for such activities.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5418    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07,2010 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 visit the Outer banks every year with my family and would love to ORV's banished from Cape Hatteras. ORV's are loud, noisy, polluting and distracting. Why are such a small group of people permitted to put their interest above those who wish to enjoy a pristine seashore and the needs of the birds and turtles that nest in this delicate ecosystem? I think the entire concept of taking an ORV into a park is selfish and should not be permitted. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 5419    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:13:11  
**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:** 5420    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:13:11  
**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:** 5421    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:13:11  
**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:** 5422    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** bricks, Georg  
**Received:** May.07.2010 06:18:38  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** The outer banks needs to have open beaches.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5423    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07.2010 06:40:05  
**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:** 5424    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07.2010 06:40:05  
**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:** 5425    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07.2010 06:40:05  
**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:** 5426    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,07,2010 06:40:10

**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:** 5427    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,07,2010 06:40:10

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am a North Carolina native who cherishes our coastline and believe it is one of the most beautiful in the continental United States. It breaks my heart that simple steps to protect our beaches haven't been taken to preserve the long term health of this great, natural asset. 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:** 5428    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,07,2010 06:40:10

**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:** 5429    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,07,2010 06:40:10

**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:** 5430    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,07,2010 06:40:15

**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:** 5431    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,07,2010 06:40:15

**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.

Cape Hatteras is one of the few beach areas I know of where ORV use is permitted on beach/wildlife areas. Its fun for those who have ORV's and has been allowed for many years. Its not necessary tho. It is necessary that we keep some areas of this pristine beach available and safe for wildlife. I live near Va Beach and enjoy it year round. To my knowledge the only area of Va Beach that is legal for ORV's is the southern end at Sandbridge. Va Beach has taken another step to make the beach accessible for people with disabilities and yet not harmed the wildlife. They have put wooden catwalks from the boardwalk almost to the ocean where handicapped people can ride wheelchairs down to the waters edge and enjoy it from sideareas off the catwalks. These catwalks have harmed no wildlife and do not interfere with non-handicapped persons from enjoying and accessing beach areas. My congratulations to Va Beach for this new method of making the beach more accessible to persons yet not disturbing wildlife. It is something possibly Cape Hatteras could consider.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5432    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,07,2010 06:40:15

**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. North Carolina is my home and I also own property on the North Carolina coast, an area of the state that has always been so dear to my heart. 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:** 5433    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:40:15  
**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:** 5434    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I support Alternative D of the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore, 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:  
If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors.  
Recreational use should first protect the natural resources and wildlife. The preferred 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.  
A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals 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:** 5435    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:40:20  
**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:** 5436    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:40:20  
**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:** 5437    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:40:21  
**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:** 5438    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:40:21  
**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:** 5439    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:40:21  
**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:** 5440    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:40:21  
**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:** 5441    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:40:21  
**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:** 5442    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:40:21  
**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:** 5443    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:40:26  
**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:** 5444    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:40:26  
**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:** 5445    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Beaches of Cape Hatteras are nesting areas for shore birds and sea turtles. Under no circumstances should vehicles be allowed on any beaches while eggs or young are present on any beaches in the area. Some migrating birds are dependent on feeding just at the edge of surf and sand to get enough food to complete their migratory cycles. Other birds winter on North Carolina beaches. Even when the obvious birds and reptiles are not present there are invertebrate animals in the sands at all times. Sand is compacted by vehicles and these animals are negatively impacted. Since they are the food for larger animals the impact goes right up the food chain. Beach grasses that help to control erosion are also destroyed by vehicles. Vehicles are also a danger to pedestrian on the beach or children playing near the surf. I have had ORV come flying by me at very close range. The best plan is to have no vehicles on the beach at any time.  
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until 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 MUST be allowed within the

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5446    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:40:26  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As a frequent visitor, 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:** 5447    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:40:26  
**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:** 5448    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:40:28  
**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:** 5449    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:40:31  
**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:** 5450    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:40:31  
**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:** 5451    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:40:32  
**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:** 5452    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:40:32  
**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:** 5453    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:40:32  
**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:** 5454    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:40:32  
**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:** 5455    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:40:32  
**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:** 5456    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:40:32  
**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:** 5457    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:40:37  
**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:** 5458    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:40:37  
**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:** 5459    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:40:37  
**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:** 5460    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:40:37  
**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:** 5461    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:40:37  
**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:** 5462    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:40:37  
**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:** 5463    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:40:42  
**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:** 5464    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:40:42  
**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:** 5465    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 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.  
I have been going to the Outer Banks since I was a small child. The area has had a great deal of change in the fifty years I have been visiting. The whole area is already pushed to the limit. The ORV.s have plenty of area to ruin. They don't need all of it. I don't think they should be allowed to do so. I know that this has always been going on, but the people today have no respect for anything! Please don't let the whole area be ruined, let's push for protection.

**Correspondence ID:** 5466    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:40:42  
**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:** 5467    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:40:48  
**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:** 5468    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:40:48  
**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:** 5469    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:40:48  
**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:** 5470    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:40:48

**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:** 5471    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:40:48

**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:** 5472    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:40:53

**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:** 5473    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:40:53  
**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:** 5474    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:40:53  
**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:** 5475    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:40:53  
**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:** 5476    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private

**Received:** May,07,2010 06:40:53  
**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:** 5477    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:40:54  
**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:** 5478    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:40:54  
**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:** 5479    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:40:56  
**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:** 5480    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:40:57  
**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:** 5481    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:40:58  
**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:** 5482    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:40:58  
**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:** 5483    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:40:58  
**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:** 5484    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:40:59  
**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:** 5485    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:41:03  
**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:** 5486    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:41:04  
**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:** 5487    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:41:04  
**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:** 5488    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:41:04  
**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:** 5489    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:41:04  
**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:** 5490    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07.2010 06:41:09  
**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:** 5491    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07.2010 06:41:09  
**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:** 5492    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07.2010 06:41:09  
**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:** 5493    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:41:09  
**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:** 5494    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:41:09  
**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:** 5495    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:41:09  
**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:** 5496    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:41:14  
**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:** 5497    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:41:15  
**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:** 5498    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:41:15  
**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:** 5499    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:41:15  
**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:** 5500    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:41:15  
**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:** 5501    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:41:15  
**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:** 5502    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:41:15  
**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:** 5503    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private

**Received:** May,07,2010 06:41:15  
**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:** 5504    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:41:21  
**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:** 5505    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:41:21  
**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:** 5506    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:41:21  
**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:** 5507    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:41:21  
**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:** 5508    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:41:21  
**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:** 5509    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:41:21  
**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:** 5510    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:41:26  
**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:** 5511    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:41:27  
**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:** 5512    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:41:27  
**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:** 5513    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:41:27  
**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:** 5514    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:41:27  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As a regular visitor to the Outer Banks of North Carolina, 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:** 5515    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:41:32  
**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:** 5516    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:41:32  
**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:** 5517    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:41:32  
**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:** 5518    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:41:32  
**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:** 5519    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:41:32  
**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:** 5520    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:41:37  
**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:** 5521    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:41:37  
**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:** 5522    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:41:37  
**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:** 5523    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:41:37  
**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:** 5524    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:41:38  
**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:** 5525    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:41:38  
**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:** 5526    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 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.  
 Having visited Cape Hatteras National Seashore, I have seen firsthand the seashore covered in vehicles and the drivers' disregard for the delicate balance of the environment and the creatures that inhabit the area. Many drivers try to push the limits of their vehicles to see if their vehicles can "pull" out of the sand, ultimately leaving deep ruts and disturbed beach. Vehicles drive through gathered shore birds purposely to scatter them from resting on the shore.  
 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:** 5527    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:41:43

**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:** 5528    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:41:43

**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:** 5529    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:41:43

**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:** 5530    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07.2010 06:41:43  
**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:** 5531    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07.2010 06:41:43  
**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:** 5532    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07.2010 06:41:43  
**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:** 5533    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07.2010 06:41:48  
**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:** 5534    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May.07.2010 06:41:48

**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:** 5535    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May.07.2010 06:41:48

**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:** 5536    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May.07.2010 06:41:48

**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:** 5537    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:41:48  
**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:** 5538    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:41:48  
**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:** 5539    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:41:48  
**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:** 5540    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y



**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:42:58  
**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:** 5541    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 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 feel that it is your responsibility to see that the final plan reflects the will of the majority of all citizens, that is what democracy is all about. A vocal minority must not be allowed to have an unproportionate impact on the decision.  
In my opinion, there should be NO orvs anywhere in any national park! They are ruining our environment.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5542    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:42:59  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5543    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:43:03  
**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:** 5544    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:43:03  
**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:** 5545    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:43:03  
**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:** 5546    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,07,2010 06:43:03

**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:** 5547    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,07,2010 06:43:04

**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:** 5548    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,07,2010 06:43:04

**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:** 5549    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07,2010 06:43:04  
**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.  
Birds and turtles can't live with ORV's, but ORV's can work around the birds and 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.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 5550    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07,2010 06:43:09  
**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:** 5551    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07,2010 06:43:09  
**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:** 5552    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:43:09  
**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:** 5553    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:43:09  
**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:** 5554    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:43:15  
**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:** 5555    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan.  
\*ORVs should be prohibited period. They are extremely harmful to the environment, animals and people! Pedestrians and families should be able to safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife should have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural 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 protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5556    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:43:27  
**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:** 5557    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:43:33  
**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:** 5558    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

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

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. I believe future generations will mourn the loss of the birds, turtles and other creatures if we continue to let them slip away.

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

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5559    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,07,2010 06:43:34

**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:** 5560    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,07,2010 06:43:39

**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.

Cape Hatteras is 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:** 5561    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,07,2010 06:43:39

**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:** 5562    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:43:39  
**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:** 5563    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:43:39  
**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:** 5564    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 06:43:39  
**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:** 5565    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07.2010 06:43:39  
**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:** 5566    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07.2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I vacation in the Outer Banks 2 to 3 times a year

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 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:** 5567    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07.2010 07:09:45  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** TO Whom It May Concern;

I am writing on behalf of my family who have been vacationing on the Outer Banks for the past 6 years. It is my parent's who first vacationed here over 20 years ago that instilled in me the desire to return to bring my children to what has become tradition, appreciation, beauty and memories that will last a lifetime. I believe that the good people of the Outer Banks have something to share with all of us. To take that away a Public Park for years, would be a travesty. We can honor our environment without eliminating public access. If respect is taught correctly, we should all be able to enjoy the beauty of the Outer Banks. Also, I should think in times as they are, the Local, and State economy would suffer greatly without the tourists, and the families who have homes that vacation on the Outer Banks and those who support business on Hatteras Island. Please think long and carefully on the impact the denial of beach access would have. I have for years talked to friends about what Hatteras Island has to offer, and that once you go, you will always return. Please let's hope we can keep it that way.

Yours Truly,  
 Laura J. Krementowski

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5568    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07.2010 07:10:10  
**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:** 5569    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:10:10  
**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:** 5570    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 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. I own a Jeep and enjoy driving in out-of-the-way, wild places. But I also know that it is important to preserve these places for wildlife and people on foot. I remember hiking for hours in the deep mountains of Idaho, only to have the serenity destroyed by the brp brp brp of motorcycles. I had a similar experience while winter camping on an ocean beach in Maryland. Sure, people need places to ride off-road vehicles, but people and wildlife also need places where no vehicles are permitted.  
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:** 5571    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** What are off- road vehicles doing on nesting beaches anyhow...they belong on a road, not on beaches intended for wildlife sanctuary and nesting. In light of the devastating loss of sealife in the Gulf oil spill, a revised plan for the care of Cape Hatteras would seem logical and necessary.  
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.  
 Off road vehicles have had too much access to our too-few beach sanctuaries. It is time to protect these areas, not try to provide access to cars which already control too many of our natural lands. The National Park Service needs to focus its efforts on the protection of wildlife, not on managing vehicle access to supposedly protected beaches. Vehicles belong on roadways, not on beaches.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5572    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:10:10  
**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. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
 Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
 Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until 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:** 5573    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:10:10  
**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:** 5574    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:10:15  
**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:** 5575    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:10:15  
**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:** 5576    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:10:15  
**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:** 5577    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:10:15  
**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:** 5578    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:10:21  
**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:** 5579    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:10:21  
**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:** 5580    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:10:21  
**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:** 5581    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:10:21  
**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.

I have visited the Outer Banks and hope to visit again. Please prohibit or limit ORV use. The natural resources at the Outer Banks are too precious to lose.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5582    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:10:26  
**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:** 5583    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:10:26  
**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:** 5584    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:10:26  
**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.

Thank you for protecting the turtles!!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5585    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:10:26  
**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:** 5586    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:10:26  
**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:** 5587    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:10:26  
**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:** 5588    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:10:32  
**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:** 5589    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:10:32  
**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:** 5590    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:10:33  
**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:** 5591    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 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.  
 I have to admit that I have driven out on those beaches many times over the years but, now that I understand the problem better, I vow to never drive on them again. I'm sure most intelligent folks would be more than happy to make the same very small sacrifice to help keep the area so special.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5592    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:10:34  
**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:** 5593    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:10:34  
**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.  
 Please protect the wildlife in every way you can. This is the right thing to do. This is what most people want.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5594    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:10:39  
**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:** 5595    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:10:39  
**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:** 5596    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:10:39  
**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:** 5597    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:10:39  
**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:** 5598    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:10:39  
**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:** 5599    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:10:39  
**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:** 5600    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:10:44  
**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:** 5601    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:10:44  
**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:** 5602    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:10:45  
**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:** 5603    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:10:45  
**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:** 5604    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:10:45  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I vacation every summer on the Outer Banks of North Carolina and love this beautiful and unique place. I believe the reason it is as beautiful as it is today is because of the preservation of the National Park system on the islands, and I hope it stays that way.  
 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:** 5605    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 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:** 5606    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:10:45  
**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:** 5607    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:10:45  
**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:** 5608    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:10:50  
**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:** 5609    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:10:50  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I dear Sirs, 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.  
Sincerely, Vito Bottari via san faustino 10 Bergamo, VA 24027- United States

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5610    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:10:50  
**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:** 5611    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:10:50  
**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.

0010411

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:** 5612    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07.2010 07:10:50  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 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.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5613    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07.2010 07:10:50  
**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:** 5614    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07.2010 07:10:50  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** We have something special to preserve. Let's do it. 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:** 5615    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07.2010 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 principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
--Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only

16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

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

--Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until 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:** 5616    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:10:56  
**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:** 5617    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:10:56  
**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:** 5618    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:10:56  
**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:** 5619    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 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.  
As a homeowner in Southern Shores (NC), I am particularly concerned that we not allow our use of the beach to threaten other species. I would appreciate your working to prevent this type of destruction however possible, including better education of the dangers ORVs pose to other species. Perhaps publicity would help, including signs on the beaches.  
thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5620    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:10:56  
**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:** 5621    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:10:56  
**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:** 5622    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:10:56  
**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:** 5623    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:10:56  
**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:** 5624    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:10:56  
**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:** 5625    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:11:01  
**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:** 5626    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07.2010 07:11:01  
**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:** 5627    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07.2010 07:11:01  
**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:** 5628    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07.2010 07:11:01  
**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:** 5629    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:11:01  
**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:** 5630    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:11:01  
**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:** 5631    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:11:07  
**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:** 5632    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:11:07

**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:** 5633    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y**Name:** private**Received:** May,07,2010 07:11:07**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:** 5634    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y**Name:** private**Received:** May,07,2010 07:11:07**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:** 5635    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y**Name:** private**Received:** May,07,2010 07:11:07**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:** 5636    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:11:07  
**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. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until 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:** 5637    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:11:07  
**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:** 5638    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:11:07  
**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:** 5639    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:11:13  
**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:** 5640    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:11:13  
**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:** 5641    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:11:13  
**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:** 5642    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:11:13  
**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:** 5643    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:11:13  
**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:** 5644    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:11:14  
**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:** 5645    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:11:14  
**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:** 5646    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:11:14  
**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:** 5647    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:11:19  
**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:** 5648    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:11:19  
**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:** 5649    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:11:19  
**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:** 5650    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:11:19  
**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:** 5651    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:11:20  
**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:** 5652    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:11:20  
**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:** 5653    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07.2010 07:11:26  
**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:** 5654    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07.2010 07:11:26  
**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:** 5655    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07.2010 07:11:26  
**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:** 5656    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:11:26  
**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:** 5657    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:11:26  
**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:** 5658    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:11:26  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am writing concerning the future management of off-road vehicles (ORV) within Cape Hatteras National Seashore on North Carolina's Outer Banks. Years of unregulated ORV use have taken their toll on Hatteras, contributing to a dramatic decline in wildlife populations in the area. The park's beaches are crucial nesting areas for rare birds and threatened and endangered sea turtles and their young. Each of these species is federally protected under the Endangered Species Act, and the National Park Service has a legal obligation to protect them.  
Please adopt responsible guidelines for the use of ORV on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. I urge the National Park Service to implement the strongest protection possible for the future well-being of imperiled wildlife at Hatteras.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5659    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:11:32  
**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:** 5660    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:11:32  
**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:** 5661    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:11:32  
**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:** 5662    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:11:32  
**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:** 5663    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:11:32  
**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:** 5664    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:11:32  
**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:** 5665    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:11:34  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I grew up going to the Outer Banks, and looked forward to it every summer. I spent hours wandering along the shore, from Kitty Hawk to Emerald Isle. But my favorite times were always when we took the ferry out to Cape Hatteras National Park. I loved this wilderness, how isolated it felt, and all the birds and turtles that nested on the shore.  
 One thing I always hated, though, was when a car came driving up. As a kid it took away the feeling of being on an adventure, and I always worried about the bird nests I had just seen. What if the turtles got run over, or the baby turtles got caught in the tracks of the tire tracks, and never made it to the ocean?  
 Now that I am an adult, I still love Cape Hatteras, and am more active in its protection. As a kid, I worried about the cars driving on the beach, and now as a well informed adult I realize my worries were well founded. Although only a few people drive cars on the beach, these effects cars have a huge impact, both on the wildlife and on the enjoyment the rest of the visitors have.  
 There are many places to drive on the beach in the developed regions of Outer Banks, but one of the amazing things about Cape Hatteras is its feeling of isolation, as though you have wandered into a place which has been intentionally protected by people who know the past, and want their grandchildren to have the opportunity to love a place away from the mechanical noise of cars. To walk down the beach and find a the trail where baby turtles crawled into the ocean, not the tire tracks where they were trapped and consumed by crabs. To be amazed by the park service putting family enjoyment and nature protection as a priority, rather than allowing troublemakers to smuggle cases of beer in the back of their trucks.  
 In summary: I support Alternative D, if you would please change it to put more emphasis on pedestrian access and greatly limit the area which cars can drive on the beach. Preferably, they would not be allowed at all.  
 Thank you very much for allowing me to comment, and taking the time to read and review all of these inputs. What you do is so important, and in many places it is only in the national parks that I can get away from the sounds of the city and experience the work of people who steward the land.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5666    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:11:37  
**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:** 5667    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:11:37  
**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:** 5668    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:11:37  
**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:** 5669    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:11:37  
**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:** 5670    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:11:37  
**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:** 5671    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:11:38  
**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:** 5672    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:11:44  
**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:** 5673    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:11:44  
**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:** 5674    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:11:44  
**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:** 5675    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:11:44  
**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:** 5676    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:11:44  
**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:** 5677    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:11:44  
**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:** 5678    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:11:49  
**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) use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. I support maximizing the restrictions on ORV use, as ORV use has too high an environmental impact and diminishes the enjoyment of those who get out of their vehicles to truly experience a place.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5679    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:11:49  
**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:** 5680    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:11:49  
**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:** 5681    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:11:49  
**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:** 5682    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:11:49  
**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:** 5683    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:11:49  
**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:** 5684    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:11:55  
**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:** 5685    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:11:55  
**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:** 5686    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:11:55  
**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:** 5687    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:11:55  
**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:** 5688    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:11:55  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am writing to you 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.  
It is important not to place short-term pleasures for a minority of people over the long-term wealth fare of the environment for future generations.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5689    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:11:55  
**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:** 5690    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:11:55  
**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:** 5691    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:12:00  
**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:** 5692    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:12:00  
**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:** 5693    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:12:00  
**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:** 5694    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:12:00  
**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:** 5695    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:12:00  
**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:** 5696    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:12:00  
**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:** 5697    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:12:05  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I love the Outer Banks - it's one of my favorite places in the world to visit. I've always been surprised and even shocked that vehicles are allowed on the beaches. I know last summer I went on a wild horse tour and for the first time ever was in a vehicle on the beach, our guide told us about horses that get hit and killed by the vehicles that drive up and down the beaches racing each other at night, and the drivers are frequently drunk. I was so disturbed by those stories, but had not even thought about the other animals like the turtles that need the beach to lay their eggs and then the babies need to get safely back to the ocean.  
I felt that the vehicles all over the beach not only took away from the beauty of the Outer Banks, I also felt that lots of young crazy drivers were putting many in danger. I am all for not allowing so many vehicles out there and stricter enforcement on the drivers behavior - this will keep the beaches safe for all of the animals and people.  
I plan to return to the Outer Banks over and over again, it for me is one of the most beautiful places in America.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5698    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:12:05  
**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:** 5699    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:12:49  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5700    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:12:49  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5701    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:12:49  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.



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

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5702    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:13:05  
**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:** 5703    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:13:05  
**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:** 5704    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:13:05  
**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:** 5705    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:13:05  
**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:** 5706    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:13:19  
**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:** 5707    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:13:19  
**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:** 5708    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:13:19  
**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.  
Although my wife and I get to Hatteras much less than we used to when our son was growing up, we remember the open beaches and grassy dunes. That was in the 1970s when there were still lots of piping plovers and sea turtles. Now it's 2010 and both plovers and sea turtles are down 90%. Back in the 1970s, liberal ORV rules made sense, but now with plunging populations of rare species, we must tighten the ORV rules to match the changed circumstances.  
Please choose Alternative D of the proposed management plan.  
Cheers, Larry and Louise Barden Charlotte, NC

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5709    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:13:19  
**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:** 5710    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:13:28  
**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:** 5711    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:13:28  
**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:** 5712    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:13:28  
**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:** 5713    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:13:28  
**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:** 5714    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07.2010 07:13:28  
**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:** 5715    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07.2010 07:13:28  
**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:** 5716    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07.2010 07:13:28  
**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:** 5717    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07.2010 07:13:28  
**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:** 5718    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07.2010 07:13:33  
**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:** 5719    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07.2010 07:13:33  
**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.  
I use the seashore frequently as a pedestrian (I even hike from the parking lot out to cape point regularly), and the quality of my experience is generally diminished by the presence of ORVs. Furthermore, I feel strongly that the seashore's core mission of protecting birds, turtles, and other wildlife, is of paramount importance in formulating any management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5720    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07.2010 07:13:33  
**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:** 5721    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:13:33

**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:** 5722    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:13:33

**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:** 5723    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:13:33

**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:** 5724    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:13:33

**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:** 5725    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:13:33

**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:** 5726    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:13:33

**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:** 5727    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 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.  
My entire family and our local nature groups have been visiting the outer banks and the National Seashore for the last 30 years. We have spent many nights in Nags Head and Buxton in the pursuit of wildlife and the serenity that the area gives us. It is also one of the few major resting and nesting areas for species that are quickly running out of homes. Please, Please Please pick Alternative D or all of these tourist dollars into the local economy my dry up. That pales in comparison to loosing our nature because it was run over on the beach by an ORV!  
Thanks!  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 5728    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:13:39  
**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:** 5729    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:13:39  
**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:** 5730    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07,2010 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. People who use ORVs should be prohibited from more than a meager 16 miles. 50 miles would be fairer to these small creatures. How can they survive with monsters ruining their land?  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 5731    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07,2010 07:13:39  
**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.  
I believe every effort should be made to protect these beaches.....  
If you are duty bound to provide these areas for ALL Americans, then you are bound to protect them for ALL Americans to enjoy. Not just the few irresponsible folks on ATVs or ORVs.....  
The beaches should be kept pristine. I have not yet seen these areas, as I am sure millions of americans have not either, and when the time comes to visit, I would like to see them as they were. Not ripped up with tire tracks.  
The very least you can do is protect at least some of the areas. And it should be a large area.....because not only is the sight of these vehicles and tracks the issue, the SOUND should also be an 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.  
Thank you and hopefully there will be birds and turtles for me to see some day.

**Correspondence ID:** 5732    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07,2010 07:13:39  
**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:** 5733    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07,2010 07:13:45  
**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:** 5734    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Dossenbach, Robert  
**Received:** May.07,2010 07:28:24  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Thank you for giving all parties a chance to comment. I am for ORV access as well as keeping our wildlife protected. I was not intending to write a letter, but when I received an email from Defenders of Wildlife, I had to respond. The DOW really knows how to spin anything in their favor. The closures being put up by NPS are very unreasonable just for a bird, and some of these birds are not even on the endangered list. I don't believe our President is protected with this much of a buffer. As far as giving wildlife a place of their own at CHNSRA, there is plenty of shoreline between Oregon inlet and Rodanthe that can not be used for ORV use. If the issues in hand were really about the birds and their eggs and the turtles and their eggs....why not move them to the shorelines mentioned above?  
When the Consent decree was put into place 2 years ago, there has NOT been an increase in fledged birds. Nature takes its course in its own way, but we still have people thinking they are God and can save each precious animal they deem good enough to be saved. I do not think the NPS can come up when the last time a bird or turtle egg has been crushed by ORVs.  
I personally have been traveling to the Outer Banks since 1998 when a friend introduced me to this beautiful area. I love traveling on the beaches with my ORV and consider myself a steward of this magnificent beach. I would never intentionally try to run over a bird, turtle or any other wildlife on these beaches. And I also know I speak for other ORV users in this matter to give us the right and opportunity to share the beaches with wildlife. If NPS is protecting a nest, fine. Just don't take the beach all the way to the water....give ORV users a corridor to get thru...in other words, ACCESS.  
Give ORV users a fair outcome in this situation as well as the wildlife. We CAN co-exist with wildlife AND get fair access for all types of recreation.  
Thanks again for the opportunity to respond.  
(As you are aware, this was not a pre-written form letter that you will see from a vast majority of people associated with Defenders of Wildlife and other affiliates. It from me and my personal feelings.)  
Sincerely, Robert Dossenbach OBPA member

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5735    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07,2010 07:30:28  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Until there is free and open beach access, our family will not return to the Outer Banks for vacation as we have been doing since 1989.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5736    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Fish, Nancy D  
**Received:** May.07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** May 7, 2010  
Mr. Mike Murray, Superintendent Cape Hatteras National Seashore 1401 National Park Drive Manteo, North Carolina 27954  
Dear Superintendent Murray:  
I am writing on behalf of the N.C. Marine Fisheries Commission to comment on the Draft ORV Management Plan/EIS (DEIS) for the Cape Hatteras National Seashore.  
Our commission is charged with regulating recreational and commercial fishing activities in the coastal waters of North Carolina and we feel strongly that fishing is an appropriate and traditional use of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore. It is our belief that access should and can be maximized for all user groups while providing protection of our natural resources.  
Our commission, along with the Division of Marine Fisheries, had representatives on the Negotiated Rulemaking Advisory Committee which ended without consensus. We find that many of the statements and positions of the Coalition for Beach Access are consistent with the work of the Negotiated Rulemaking Advisory Committee; therefore, we endorse and support the following portions of the position statement of the Coalition for Beach Access relative to the Draft ORV Management Plan/EIS (DEIS) for the Cape Hatteras National Seashore:  
? 3.0 Importance of Public Beach Access ? 3.1 Traditional and Cultural Values ? 3.2.3 Fishing ? 3.2.8 High Recreational Value Ocean Beaches ? 3.2.9 High Recreational Value Sound Side Locations ? 3.3 Commercial Values ? 5.0 Selected Legislation and Management Policies Relevant to an ORV Plan

? 6.1 ORV Ocean Side Ramps ? 7.0 Conclusion In addition to the above comments, the Marine Fisheries Commission is concerned about the recommendation that Hatteras Inlet Spit and North Ocracoke Spit areas be classified as non-ORV areas year round. These locations are very important to the recreational and commercial fishing public. We believe seasonal access could be allowed while protecting species of concern.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this important issue of mutual concern.

Sincerely, W. Robert Bizzell, Chairman N. C. Marine Fisheries Commission

Cc: N.C. Marine Fisheries Commission N.C. DMF Director Louis Daniel Habitat and Water Quality Advisory Committee Anne Deaton Sara Winslow

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5737    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:40:14  
**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:** 5738    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:40:14  
**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:** 5739    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:40:14  
**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:** 5740    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private

**Received:** May,07,2010 07:40:19  
**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:** 5741    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:40:19  
**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:** 5742    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:40:19  
**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:** 5743    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:40:19  
**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:** 5744    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:40:19  
**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:** 5745    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:40:19  
**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:** 5746    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:40:19  
**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:** 5747    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:40:25  
**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:** 5748    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:40:25  
**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:** 5749    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:40:25  
**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:** 5750    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:40:25  
**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:** 5751    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 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:** 5752    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:40:26  
**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:** 5753    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:40:31  
**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:** 5754    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07.2010 07:40:31  
**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:** 5755    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07.2010 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.  
Enjoying the beach and nature is altered when vehicles are allowed on the beach. Usually they are loud, smell and disturb the environment. With all that is happening in the environment it would be a good time to limit the destruction done by man.  
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. The National Parks are to be available to everyone but they are a park and supposed to protect wildlife for future generations.  
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until 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:** 5756    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07.2010 07:40:32  
**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:** 5757    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Erwin, Michael  
**Received:** May.07,2010 07:40:33  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I first wish to comment the National Park Service for engaging in an involved, deliberate and transparent process in this controversial issue that is now about two decades old. The current administration of the Seashore, and several levels above in the NPS and Interior Department, realize the significance of the important natural resources at risk in the Park, especially when faced with greater human disturbance as well as climate change. Balancing those needs with human recreation is the professional challenge that all NPS managers must face. I have several comments to make, even though I admit to not reading the entire 600+ page document. I do concur however with selection of Alternative F by the NPS as the preferred alternative. My major comments are: 1. I was pleased to see that ORV permits would now be required for all off-road use in CAHA. In addition, having an educational course required is important. I commend the establishment of a fee structure as well. This fee should be set at a rate (based on an estimate of the maximum vehicle use during summer weekends at CAHA) to offset the costs of hiring additional seasonal law enforcement personnel to monitor the beach use and implement control measures. 2. As at other Seashores, I would prefer to see a numerical limit placed on ORVs using certain access ramps. With no limit set, an unsustainable number of vehicles could accumulate and ruin both the recreational experience as well as degrade the environment. 3. I commend the NPS on maintaining the buffer distances for the various bird species and sea turtles. 4. In chapter 5, under Consultation and Coordination, I did not see mention of any type of oversight committee or board. As the NPS adheres to a policy of using adaptive management, it seems a review process by an external panel or committee made up of scientists and managers should be established to periodically review protocols and results of key management operations. This allows for future modification and flexibility in CAHA management.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5758    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07,2010 07:40:37  
**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:** 5759    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07,2010 07:40:37  
**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:** 5760    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07,2010 07:40:37  
**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:** 5761    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:40:37  
**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:** 5762    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:40:37  
**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:** 5763    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:40:37  
**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. I have been visiting the Outer Banks for 20+ years, and vacationing on Hatteras Island for the past 10 years. Of all the places I have travelled in my life, the beaches of Hatteras Island are my favorite. Please don't allow people to spoil this treasure.  
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:** 5764    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:40:43  
**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:** 5765    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:40:44  
**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:** 5766    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:40:44  
**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:** 5767    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private

**Received:** May,07,2010 07:40:45  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As a North Carolinian, 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.  
 I spent my summers at Cape Hatteras in awe of the beauty of this place, and I want future generations to be able to do so as well.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5768    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:40:45  
**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:** 5769    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:40:50  
**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:** 5770    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:40:50  
**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:** 5771    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Since moving to North Carolina six years ago, my family has greatly enjoyed the easy accessibility of many beautiful outdoor spaces. In fact, that was one of the greatest attractions of North Carolina for us! We're all animal lovers, too, and love the opportunity to enjoy wildlife in its natural habitat rather than only in a zoo. That's why I'm writing to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage off-road vehicle traffic on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Although we haven't been to Cape Hatteras yet, it's definitely in our plans. Seeing the turtles and other rare wildlife will be quite a treat for our children, so I wanted to let you know my thoughts on the proposed plans.  
Of these, I support Alternative D if it can be modified to provide greater pedestrian access. As you know, this was identified as the environmentally preferred alternative in the DEIS. 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 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:** 5772    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:40:50  
**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:** 5773    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:40:50  
**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:** 5774    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:40:50  
**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:** 5775    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 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. I am personally very concerned about the fate of many forms of wildlife, especially critically endangered sea turtles that lay their eggs on these beaches and many shorebirds that depend on the Cape Hatteras National Seashore, if this critical area is opened to extensive OTV use. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, Alternative D seems to be the best choice if it can be 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.  
At a minimum, the park's final plan should consider the following principals if the modified version of Alternative D is not enacted:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: If ORV use is allowed within the park, please reserve at least half of the beach year round for non-ORV users and wildlife, particularly considering wildlife nesting, wintering and migration areas. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
Put Natural 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 protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers should, at a minimum, protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until 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 thank you for your thoughtful consideration of these issues as you move forward in the development of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Management Plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5776    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:40:50  
**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:** 5777 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:40:57  
**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:** 5778 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:40:57  
**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:** 5779 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:40:57  
**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:** 5780 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 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.

I visit the Outer Banks frequently. One of my favorite activities there is being able to observe all the wildlife that abounds there. I sincerely hope that my grandchildren and their grandchildren will also have the opportunity to see this also. It would be so very sad, if one day, future generations could view many of the wildlife through archived data only.

Please protect these fragile lifeforms.

Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5781    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:40:57  
**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:** 5782    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:40:57  
**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:** 5783    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:40:58  
**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:** 5784    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:40:58  
**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:** 5785    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:41:03  
**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:** 5786    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:41:03  
**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:** 5787    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 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. Although I have not yet been to Cape Hatteras, during my undergraduate years, I took two classes at the Dauphin Island Sea Lab, off the Alabama coast. During the field work for those classes, we learned about the damage ORVs could do to the grasses growing on the dunes. Without those grasses, the dunes become unstable or are destroyed, thus wiping out a primary barrier to hurricane winds and water damage to homes constructed further inland. In addition, some of our field work took place in the tern and skimmer rookeries on Dauphin Island, a magical place, where the birds lay their eggs and rear their young directly on the sand of the beaches. Any ORV use in such nursery areas would result in significant deaths of the young birds. Turtles nesting on such beaches would be even more vulnerable, since there are so many fewer of them than there are sea birds.  
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:** 5788    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:41:03  
**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:** 5789    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:41:03  
**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:** 5790    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:41:03  
**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:** 5791    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:41:08  
**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:** 5792    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:41:08  
**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:** 5793    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:41:08  
**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:** 5794    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:41:09  
**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:** 5795    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:41:09  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As a North Carolinian who loves the Outer Banks and its wildlife, 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:** 5796    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:41:09  
**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:** 5797    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:41:09  
**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:** 5798    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:41:09  
**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:** 5799    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:41:14  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Thanks you for this opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. 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:** 5800    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:41:14  
**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:** 5801    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:41:20  
**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:** 5802    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:41:20  
**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:** 5803    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:41:20  
**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:** 5804    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:41:20

**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:** 5805    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:41:20

**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:** 5806    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 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:

Personally speaking, I would prefer NO ORV on the beach but I know that isn't realistic so. Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

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

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



implemented until 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:** 5807    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:41:20  
**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:** 5808    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:41:20  
**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:** 5809    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 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.  
On a personal note, I despise these ORVs. They are loud, often run by people who are drunk or out of control, and they tear up the landscape. They also terrorize the critters in the area. I would support banning ALL of them except on a person's own land.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5810    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:41:25  
**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:** 5811    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:41:25  
**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:** 5812    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:41:25  
**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:** 5813    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:41:25  
**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:** 5814    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:41:25  
**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:** 5815    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:41:25  
**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:** 5816    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:41:31  
**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.

as breeding ones.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5817    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07.2010 07:41:31  
**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:** 5818    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07.2010 07:41:31  
**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:** 5819    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07.2010 07:41:31  
**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:** 5820    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07.2010 07:41:31  
**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:** 5821    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May.07,2010 07:41:36

**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:** 5822    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May.07,2010 07:41:36

**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:** 5823    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May.07,2010 07:41:37

**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:** 5824    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:41:37  
**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:** 5825    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:41:37  
**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:** 5826    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:41:37  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** My husband and I love visiting the Outer Banks and the Cape Hatteras National Seashore in particular. 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:** 5827    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:41:42  
**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. I have enjoyed the beautiful all season beauty of the Outer Banks for more than 40 years and am passionate about preserving both the environment and its wildlife.  
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:** 5828    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 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. My husband and I support the defenders of wildlife organization, and their well thought out recommendations follow. I believe that it is the responsibility of the Park Service to Protect the Resources first and foremost. Particularly as we are all moving towards the big Park birthday. If there is no resource, all the rest begins to fall away. I am not insensitive to the desires for off-roaders enjoyment, but rely on the the Park Service to create a balance which will ultimately meet it's challenging charter, protect the resources. Thank you for all you do on our behalf, and that of our grandchildren and theirs.  
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:** 5829    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:41:42  
**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:** 5830    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:41:42

**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:** 5831    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,07,2010 07:41:43

**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:** 5832    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,07,2010 07:41:43

**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:** 5833    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,07,2010 07:41:43

**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:** 5834    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:41:43  
**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. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until 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:** 5835    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:41:49  
**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:** 5836    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:41:49  
**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:** 5837    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:41:49  
**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:** 5838    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:41:52  
**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:** 5839    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:41:54  
**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:** 5840    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:41:54  
**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:** 5841    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:41:54

**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:** 5842    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:41:54

**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:** 5843    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:41:54

**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:** 5844    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:41:54  
**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:** 5845    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:41:59  
**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:** 5846    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:41:59  
**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:** 5847    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:41:59  
**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:** 5848    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:41:59  
**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:** 5849    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:42:05  
**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:** 5850    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:42:05  
**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:** 5851    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:42:55  
**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:** 5852    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:42:55  
**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:** 5853    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:42:55  
**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:** 5854    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:42:56  
**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:** 5855    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:42:56  
**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:** 5856    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:42:56  
**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:** 5857    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:42:56  
**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:** 5858    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
I am a person who views wildlife as extremely important whether or not I am there to see it! It is not all about ME, but about the creatures that share this planet with us. That is why I am commenting on a plan that involves ORV use. ORVs are dangerous to wildlife and should be regulated as such. If you choose not to put Alternative D in place, it is my opinion that the following should be included: \*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. How is that fair? Half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families 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 be paramount, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 5859    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:42:56  
**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.

Sincerely, William Kopp Goodyear, AZ

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5860    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:43:03  
**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:** 5861    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:43:03  
**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:** 5862    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 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.

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

**Correspondence ID:** 5863    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:43:03  
**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:** 5864    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:43:04  
**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.  
I hope you will take this letter and its comments very seriously. Those of us who care know how important it is for people in power to listen and understand. Thank you again.

**Correspondence ID:** 5865    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:43:04  
**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:** 5866    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 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 visited this National Seashore multiple times since 1996, and each time I visit, I am amazed how a national treasure has continued to be commercialized and built upon. I don't understand how a place as unique and special as the Outer Banks and Cape Hatteras can support the seemingly unbridled loss of nature and addition of so many buildings. On top of that, the ORVs impact on what beach and natural areas are left are impacting the type of wildlife a unique place like Cape Hatteras should be designed to protect. Not only do I support control of ORVs, but I want to trust that the government looks out for and protects steadily declining natural areas in this country--especially those that have been designated as National Seashores many years ago. Please take this small step toward protecting more of what is left of this amazingly beautiful and unique area for the wildlife that depends on it and those Americans who wish to visit a national treasure.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5867    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:43:12  
**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:** 5868    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:43:12  
**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.  
When I first visited Cape Hatteras a few years ago, I was thrilled with what a wonderful place it was. The nature and beauty were spectacular. I hope that we can preserve it as such for future generations. The alternative plan mentioned would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

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

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

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

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5869    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:43:12

**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:** 5870    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:43:12

**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:** 5871    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:43:20

**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:** 5872    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,07,2010 07:43:20

**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:** 5873    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,07,2010 07:43:20

**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:** 5874    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,07,2010 07:43:20

**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:** 5875    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,07,2010 07:43:20

**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:** 5876    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,07,2010 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. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are 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.

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

**Correspondence ID:** 5877    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,07,2010 07:43:28

**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:** 5878    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:43:29  
**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:** 5879    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:43:29  
**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:** 5880    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 07:43:29  
**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:** 5881    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5882    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Mike Murray, Superintendent Cape Hatteras National Seashore 1401 National Park Drive Manteo, NC 27954  
May 7, 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?  
Kind Regards, Josh Benvenuti

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5883    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Keefe, Michael C  
**Received:** May.07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am sharing with you the comments I recently submitted on the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Off-Road Vehicle (ORV) Draft Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS).  
As an avid angler on the North Carolina seashore, I am strongly opposed to the National Park Service (NPS) preferred alternative, Alternative F, in the DEIS and urge you to make significant changes to the preferred alternative in order to provide both reasonable resource protection and reasonable public access to public land. Recreational fishing is one of the most enjoyable American pastimes, and Cape Hatteras National Seashore has some of the best surf fishing locations on the east coast - accessible only by ORV.  
Alternative F is the most restrictive management option to date, far exceeding any sense of balance between resource protection and public access and betraying all promises made to the public regarding recreational uses in the seashore. The majority of the provisions included within the preferred alternative far exceed anything proposed by a majority of the Negotiated Rulemaking Committee, including excessively large resource closures



(buffers), unnecessary year-round and floating closures, and the lack of access corridors around or through resource closures.

In order to restore balance to the DEIS, I highly recommend that the NPS revisit the proposal put forth to the Negotiated Rulemaking Committee in December of 2009. It provides the necessary protections for wildlife resources while having the support of a majority of the local community. Without reasonable ORV access, responsible anglers like me, and the local economy that is supported by recreational fishing, suffer greatly. I urge you to provide a better balance between resource protection and recreational uses by incorporating the December 2009 recommendations from the Negotiated Rulemaking Committee into the preferred alternative.

Sincerely,  
Michael Keefe

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5884	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596		
<b>Name:</b>	Harper, Samuel B						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 08:08:50						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I agree with and support Alternative A: No Action?Continuation of Management under the Interim Protected Species Management Strategy.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5885	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596		
<b>Name:</b>	Doswell, Robert						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 08:09:53						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I've been traveling to the Hatteras Beaches since the middle sixties and owned a home there for the last 15 years. None of the past policies, applied "science", closures, and restrictions have done anything but waste taxpayer dollars. I now go to a PUBLIC NATIONAL SEASHORE and am regulated by Audubon, SELC, and DOF by decree. I am against regulation by decree, I am against Alternative "F" and I am against the Seashore being run from opinions not backed by true science. I am for fair and balanced rules that incorporate common sense and ecological stewardship. No plan in the DEIS fits this description.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5886	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 08:10:21						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	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.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5887	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 08:10:24						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	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.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5888	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 08:10:25						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	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:** 5889    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May.07,2010 08:10:26

**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:** 5890    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May.07,2010 08:10:26

**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:** 5891    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May.07,2010 08:10:35

**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:** 5892    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 08:10:35  
**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:** 5893    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 08:10:35  
**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:** 5894    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 08:10:36  
**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:** 5895    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 08:10:36  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:**

These guidelines will help to save so many lives! Please support them and save the lives of all beach wildlife.

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:** 5896    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 08:10:36  
**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:** 5897    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 08:10:43  
**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:** 5898    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 08:10:45  
**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:** 5899    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07.2010 08:10:45  
**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:** 5900    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07.2010 08:10:45  
**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:** 5901    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07.2010 08:10:45  
**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:** 5902    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 08:10:45  
**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:** 5903    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 08:10:48  
**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:** 5904    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 08:10:48  
**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:** 5905    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 08:10:48

**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:** 5906    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,07,2010 08:10:48

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Cape Hatteras National Seashore beaches are crucial nesting areas for rare birds and threatened and endangered sea turtles and their young. I am in favor of more support for park visitors who enjoy areas without ORVs for recreational activities. 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:** 5907    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,07,2010 08:10:49

**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:** 5908    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,07,2010 08:10:49

**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:** 5909    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 08:10:50  
**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:** 5910    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 08:10:50  
**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:** 5911    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 08:10:56  
**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:** 5912    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 08:10:56  
**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. As a frequent visitor to the Outer Banks and the Cape Hatteras National Seashore I feel that protecting the areas wildlife is of the utmost importance. 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:** 5913    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 08:10:56  
**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:** 5914    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 08:10:56  
**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:** 5915    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 08:10:57  
**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:** 5916    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I personally would like to see a BAN on ORV usage on the Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Those pristine areas are certainly NOT the place for motorized human recreation...there are other spots available for that. Having said that, as a compromising position, I do 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:** 5917    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 08:10:57  
**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:** 5918    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 08:11:05  
**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:** 5919    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 08:11:07  
**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:** 5920    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 08:11:10  
**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:** 5921    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 08:11:11  
**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:** 5922    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 08:11:12  
**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:** 5923    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 08:11:12  
**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:** 5924    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 08:11:12  
**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:** 5925    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 08:11:12  
**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:** 5926    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I have been enjoying the Outer Banks since I was a little girl--for at least 60 years. The beauty and the magic of the place is really unmatched. The Cape Hatteras National Seashore is one of this country's most valuable resources and must be protected to every extent possible to preserve it for future generations--not just of people but of the critters who call it home as well.  
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:** 5927    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 08:11:12  
**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:** 5928    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 08:11:17  
**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:** 5929    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 08:11:18  
**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:** 5930    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 08:11:18  
**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:** 5931    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 08:11:18  
**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:** 5932    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 08:11:18  
**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:** 5933    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 08:11:19  
**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:** 5934    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 08:11:21  
**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:** 5935    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 08:11:28  
**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:** 5936    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 08:11:29  
**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:** 5937    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 08:11:29  
**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:** 5938    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 08:11:31  
**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:** 5939    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 08:11:35  
**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:** 5940    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 08:11:36  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** My husband and I vacation in and around this area and we treasure the delicacy and beauty. It is unacceptable that off road vehicles are permitted anywhere in or near the fragile landscape and ecosystem.  
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:** 5941    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 08:11:37  
**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:** 5942    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 08:11:39  
**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:** 5943    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 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.  
In closing, I have to say that it is unbelievable that public officials allow beach access to ANY type of vehicle (with the exception of emergency vehicles, when necessary). Like many North Carolinians, I have witnessed many incidents of people driving wrecklessly or carelessly on beaches, posing an immediate danger to beach-goers (including young children) and wildlife. The beach is not a place for vehicles, especially recreational ones. Drivers who are inclined to drive on a beach are not inclined to respect it, to keep it clean, or to recognize the rights of beach-goers and animals. We have laws to protect sea turtle nests and hatchlings from lights. It makes no sense at all to deny them protection from off-road vehicles, which not only pollute our PUBLIC beaches at the inconvenience of many, but pose a real danger to people and wildlife.  
I urge you to BAN--not restrict, but ban--all vehicular traffic from public beaches, as a matter of public safety and ecological protection. The rights of a few to joy-ride on the beach do not supercede the public's right to safe, clean beaches, nor do they supercede the natural rights of animals to use the beach for nesting and hatching purposes.  
What bonehead thought of opening the beaches to cars and trucks in the first place?  
Please put a complete stop to this practice and make our public beaches safe and more accessible for everyone...except for the nincompoops who want to drive on them.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5944    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 08:11:43  
**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:** 5945    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 08:11:44  
**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:** 5946    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 08:11:46  
**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:** 5947    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 08:11:47  
**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:** 5948    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 08:11:48

**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:** 5949 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y**Name:** private**Received:** May,07,2010 08:11:50**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:** 5950 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y**Name:** private**Received:** May,07,2010 08:11:50**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:** 5951 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y**Name:** private**Received:** May,07,2010 08:11:52**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:** 5952    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 08:11:54  
**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. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until 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:** 5953    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 08:11:55  
**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:** 5954    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 08:11:55  
**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:** 5955    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 08:11:59  
**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:** 5956    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 08:12:00  
**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:** 5957    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 08:12:01  
**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:** 5958    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 08:12:01  
**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:** 5959    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 08:12:02

**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:** 5960    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 08:12:02

**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:** 5961    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 08:12:05

**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:** 5962    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 08:12:07  
**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:** 5963    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 08:12:09  
**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:** 5964    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 08:12:09  
**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.  
These folks have other places to drive their vehicles. They don't have to disturb the wildlife at Hatteras. Give the animals some peace for a change.



**Correspondence ID:** 5965    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 08:12:10  
**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:** 5966    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 08:12:10  
**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:** 5967    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 08:12:12  
**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:** 5968    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 08:12:14  
**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:** 5969    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 08:12:15  
**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.  
 Sincerely, Dennis Sorrells 22701 Blue Banner Place Germantown, MD 20876

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5970    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 08:12:15  
**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:** 5971    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 08:12:15  
**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:** 5972    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 08:12:16  
**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:** 5973    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 08:12:26  
**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:** 5974    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 08:12:26  
**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:** 5975    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Owners and riders of ORV's have plenty of places to play with their toys. The beaches at Cape Hatteras should not be used for this. Hatteras is beautiful and one of the few "wild" areas left on our over developed beaches in North Carolina. Please consider conserving this area for future generations and for the wildlife who live there and procreate there.

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:** 5976    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 08:12:28  
**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:** 5977    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 08:12:28  
**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:** 5978    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 08:12:28  
**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:** 5979    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,07,2010 08:12:28

**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:** 5980    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,07,2010 08:12:36

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am a NC resident and have been visiting the Outer Banks since I was a little girl, in the 1960s. It has always been very beautiful and the birds and sea turtles are part of what makes it such a special place.

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:** 5981    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,07,2010 08:12:36

**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:** 5982    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 08:12:36  
**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:** 5983    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 08:12:36  
**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:** 5984    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 08:12:36  
**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.

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5985	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 08:12:37						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>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.</p> <p>The following principals 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>						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5986	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 08:12:37						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>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.</p> <p>The following principals 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>						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5987	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 08:12:37						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>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.</p> <p>The following principals 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>						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5988	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 08:12:58						
<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>This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to</p>						

me.

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

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

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

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

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

**Correspondence ID:** 5989    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 08:12:58  
**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:** 5990    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 08:12:58  
**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:** 5991    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 08:12:58  
**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:** 5992    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 08:12:58  
**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:** 5993    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 08:13:09  
**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:** 5994    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 08:13:09  
**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:** 5995    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 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.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 5996    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 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,  
My family, including my late parents and brother, my husband and two sons and our cousins, uncles and aunts, have been going to Cape Hatteras National Seashore since I can remember to gaze in wonder at the wildlife and beauty of the place. As soon as you arrive at the Seashore, you know that you are in a very special world. You see colonial waterbirds in flocks that you just can't find in most coastal areas. One of the most exciting aspects of the Seashore is the use of the beach by sea turtles to lay their eggs. As most of us know who have grown up reading the National Geographic, or watching Jacques Cousteau or Nature, there are only a few places in the world where these incredible creatures can successfully reproduce. And we are blessed enough to have them use OUR Seashore! We just need to take care of it by controlling the type and number of ORVs that come near the nesting grounds. I, therefore, support the Alternative D, which will be much better for both the animals and the tourists. It will benefit the natural environment, which is what makes the National Seashore at Cape Hatteras so attractive to tourists in the first place. And my family can continue to look forward to visits to this amazing place in the years to come.  
Sincerely, Katherine Clemo 4512 Laurelwood Drive, SW Roanoke, VA 24018

**Correspondence ID:** 5997    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 08:13:09  
**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.  
The spirit of the law must be met. ORV are extremely destructive to habitat and animal. Some of these species should be considered national treasures as is 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:** 5998    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 08:13:09  
**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:** 5999    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 08:13:09  
**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:** 6000    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 08:13:21  
**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.

0010528

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

---