

Correspondence ID: 6001 **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.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 6002 **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.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 6003 **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.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 6004 **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.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 6005 **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.
Put the interests of non-voting critters ahead of monied interests whether they be vehicle manufacturers, real estate 'developers', etc. The Golden Rule should not be them that has the gold makes the rules. In the end, we'll all suffer for the way we treat our environment.

Correspondence ID: 6006 **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.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 6007 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 08:13:29
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: 6008 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 08:13:29

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: 6009 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 08:13:29

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: 6010 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 08:13:29

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: 6011 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 08:13:29

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: 6012 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 08:13:29

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: 6013 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 08:13:37

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,

0010533

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: 6014 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 08:13:37
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.
Motor vehicles have the majority of America to roar and rip over. We need less of them and more quiet, peace and effective plant and animal habitat at Cape Hatteras!
I agree with the below information but forth by the National Audubon Society.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 6015 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 08:13:38
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: 6016 **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 should be a fair balance between space and the number of users for each kind of space. The ORVs do not deserve so much more space than the people and animals who don't need ORVs. Wildlife numbers have plummeted because of this unlimited or barely limited use of the vehicles. It is time to make a change for the better. Wildlife and pedestrians can live more happily w/o Alternative F. Use Alternative D.
Thank you for the opportunity to voice my concerns. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 6017 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 08:13:38
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: 6018 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 08:13:38
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: 6019 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 08:13:38
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: 6020 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 08:13:46
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: 6021 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 08:13:46
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: 6022 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 08:13:46
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: 6023 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: S, J
Received: May,07,2010 08:19:13
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: As an avid angler on the 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: 6024 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 08:19:51
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: It is with great concern that I voice my disagreement with Alt F of the DEIS. This document is far more restrictive to public use than need be. I disagree with the size of the closure around a piping plover unfledged chick brood and American oyster catcher nests as it is not necessary to have that large an area closed off (p. 121-127). I highly disagree with (p.136). The prohibition of pets is unfounded and penalizes our family for being responsible to the environment. A very high percentage of people who use these areas including My family are the ones who help maintain the environment so the wildlife is secure, because after all, that is one of the reasons we recreate there. I disagree with the socio-economic data (p. 270-286, 561-598). The data states a negligible to moderate impact to cultural resources and this can be nothing than farther from the TRUTH. Lastly I fully back the concerns of the Coalition for Beach Access stand on Alternate F. I agree with the fact that a balance between human access and resource management be adopted, this document does not do that. Thank you Michael P McDonagh Hatteras Island property owner, visitor and concerned tax payer.

Correspondence ID: 6025 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 08:22:58
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am a resident of North Carolina who enjoys recreational opportunities offered by the Cape Hatteras National Seashore and Recreational Area. Reasonable and safe pedestrian and vehicular access to the beach is essential to participate and enjoy these resources and opportunities. I also support restrictions and conditions necessary to protect the birds, sea turtles, and other biota that are supported by scientific data and can make the Seashore home for part of the year. I believe the favor alternative (#7) advanced by the NPS is more restrictive than necessary to meet protection of the Seashore. I have read and agree with the proposal to manage ORV's on the Seashore prepared and submitted for consideration by the Coalition for Beach Access. My position is that the NPS accept this alternative or at least postpone a final decision on the ORV Plan pending further review and negotiation on the counter points raised by the Coalition for Beach Access.

Correspondence ID: 6026 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 08:30:06
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: As an avid angler on the Carolina coast, 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: 6027 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 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.
Sincerely, Randy Dunster & Family

Correspondence ID: 6028 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 08:33:04
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: As a long time conservationist and Salvo, NC property owner I am also a strong proponent of recreational use of the Hatteras National Seashore as intended by the original enabling legislation. I find the position of the Coalition to be very reasonable and responsible in addressing all interests while maintaining a conservationist approach. NPS alternative F is badly flawed in adopting Draconian measures with minimal benefit and enormous consequences. One point that has not been emphasized is that this natural habitat has provide me and my family an opportunity to teach responsible stewardship of a fragile habitat to our family members. While we do rent out our property for a limited season, we leave documentation in our home to appeal to those who stay there to understand the fragile nature of the area and to treat it accordingly. We suggest guidelines to accomplish this end. My experience is that the vast majority of people who stay and recreate in this paradise treat the surroundings with respect, including those who carefully and responsibility navigate the beach in their ORVs. It would appear that a large amount of the data that have been cited to support Alternative F are badly flawed and if corrected would support a quite different conclusion.
For the rest of my comments I would defer to the statement of the Coalition which has work diligently to develop a well reasoned approach to a responsible ORV plan which addresses all interests in a balanced manner.
I hope the NPS will take the recommendations seriously not only in the interest of the human stakeholders, but also the wonderful array of natural species that share this habitat.
Thanks you,
Donald A. Kniffen

Correspondence ID: 6029 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Meyer, Matthew
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, Matthew Meyer, PhD Biotechnology Patent Analyst IKO Kiteboarding Instructor YK Kiteboarding and SUP Chesapeake Beach, MD

Correspondence ID: 6030 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 08:40:22
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: 6031 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 08:40:22
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: 6032 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 08:40:22
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: 6033 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 08:40:22
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: 6034 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 08:40:22
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: 6035 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: As a supporter of wildlife and a yearly visitor to the Outer Banks, I have seen the beauty of Cape Hatteras National Seashore firsthand and I feel strongly about protecting it. I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use there. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for your time. I hope you make the right decisions to preserve the natural beauty of Cape Hatteras National Seashore and its wildlife inhabitants.

Correspondence ID: 6036 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 08:40:27
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: 6037 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 08:40:27
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: 6038 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 08:40:27
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: 6039 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 08:40:27
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: 6040 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 08:40:27
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: 6041 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 08:40:32
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: 6042 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 08:40:32
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: 6043 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 08:40:38
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: 6044 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 08:40:38
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: 6045 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May.07.2010 08:40:38
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: 6046 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May.07.2010 08:40:38
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: 6047 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May.07.2010 08:40:43
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am opposed to allowing people to drive their "toys" on public beaches, especially national wildlife areas like the Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Wildlife protection and solitude is far more important than the selfish interests of a few.
I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Correspondence ID: 6048 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May.07.2010 08:40:43
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: 6049 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 08:40:43
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: 6050 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 08:40:43
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: 6051 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 08:40:48
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: 6052 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 08:40:48
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: 6053 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 08:40:49
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: 6054 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 08:40:49
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: 6055 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 08:40:49
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: 6056 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 08:40:49
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: 6057 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 08:40:54
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: 6058 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 08:40:54
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: 6059 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 08:40:54
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: 6060 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 08:40:54
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: 6061 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 08:40:54
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: 6062 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 08:41:00
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: 6063 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 08:41:00
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: 6064 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 08:41:00
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: 6065 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 08:41:00
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: 6066 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 08:41:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: As a permanent resident of Hatteras Island, I would like to comment on the National Park Service proposal for management of off-road vehicle use in Cape Hatteras National Seashore. I have never driven on the beach, but I walk on the beach for miles almost every day, year-round, and I have seen first-hand some of the damaging effects of ORV use on this beautiful and very fragile environment. Many of us who live here would prefer never to see a vehicle on the beach, but we want to be able to enjoy responsible recreational access, and recognize the need for compromise. Therefore I urge you to enact some modified form of Alternative D, the environmentally preferred alternative from the draft environmental impact statement. I believe this alternative, with some changes to allow more pedestrian access, would provide the best balance between recreational use and wildlife protection. I do not believe that Alternative F, the preferred plan of the National Park Service, goes far enough to protect wildlife and the rights of people like me, who would like to be able to walk the beaches of the National Seashore surrounded by birds and other wildlife, enjoying the natural beauty of this special place, without seeing cars and trucks and tire tracks. The amount of beach that is open to ORV use is excessive, and the number of vehicles on the beach is far too great. Many of us here on Hatteras Island have said for years that we need more parking areas and walkways to improve access patterns, while limiting the numbers of vehicles on the beach, and limiting the amount of beach that is accessible to ORV's. With more walkways the beaches would be easily accessible to almost everyone, and those who still choose to drive on the beach should be limited to only those areas that are the least sensitive to environmental damage. Most of the beach should be closed year-round to vehicles, so the rest of us can enjoy the resources of the National Seashore, and so that wildlife has a place to recover and thrive.

Without the natural resources, the environment and wildlife of this place, the Cape Hatteras National Seashore would lose its meaning. Protection of these resources must be the top priority in making decisions about regulating ORV use on the beach. There is plenty of room on these beaches for both people and wildlife, but people can be selfish, and wildlife needs protection, year-round. It is the duty of the National Park Service to provide that protection, and without it species will disappear, numbers of birds and other animals will continue to decline, and our grandchildren will never know the natural wonder of this unique place. The science is clear. Although regulations have helped in recent years, the numbers and diversity of resident and migratory birds and other species are far below historic norms. I urge you to enact a plan that begins to bring wildlife back to its historic abundance and diversity, that protects wildlife year-round, and that provides for monitoring, and adjusting regulations as needed if recovery goals are not met. Please don't turn your back on wildlife here at Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Please don't turn your back on people like me. Please develop a final plan that puts natural resources, and that right of pedestrians to enjoy them, above the desire to drive on the beach.

Correspondence ID: 6067 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 08:41:00
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: 6068 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 08:41:06
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: 6069 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May.07,2010 08:41:06

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: 6070 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May.07,2010 08:41:06

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: 6071 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May.07,2010 08:41:06

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: 6072 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May.07.2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: As a science teachers I am concerned that we are not teaching children the importance of stewardship of our planet and not being aggressive enough in the protection of wildlife for future generations. Please enforce measurements that provide the highest protection.
I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Correspondence ID: 6073 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May.07.2010 08:41:06
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am an occasional visitor to Cap Hatteras and think it is a wonderful place for wildlife and our natural environment. appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Correspondence ID: 6074 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May.07.2010 08:41:06
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.

as breeding ones.

Correspondence ID: 6075 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May.07.2010 08:41:11
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: 6076 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May.07.2010 08:41:12
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: 6077 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May.07.2010 08:41:12
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: 6078 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May.07.2010 08:41:12
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: 6079 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May.07.2010 08:41:12

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: 6080 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May.07.2010 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Given what is now happening to our environment as a result of the ongoing oil spill, and the precarious position of sea turtles and shore birds before this devastating event, we need to be even more mindful of the impact of our decisions, and be more focused on the long-term impact and potential unintended consequences of our actions.

I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: 6081 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May.07.2010 08:41:17

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: 6082 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 08:41:17
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: 6083 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 08:41:17
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: 6084 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 08:41:18
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: 6085 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May.07.2010 08:41:18
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: 6086 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May.07.2010 08:41:18
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: 6087 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May.07.2010 08:41:23
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Correspondence ID: 6088 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May.07.2010 08:41:23
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the

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

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: 6089 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 08:41:23

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: 6090 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 08:41:23

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: People are major contributors to the death of sea turtles. It is our responsibility to ensure the safety of the sea turtles and act as their voice. Please consider the following suggestions for reform.

I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: 6091 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 08:41:23

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: 6092 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 08:41:23
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Correspondence ID: 6093 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 08:41:23
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Correspondence ID: 6094 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 08:41:30
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Correspondence ID: 6095 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 08:41:30
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Correspondence ID: 6096 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 08:41:30
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Correspondence ID: 6097 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 08:41:30
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Correspondence ID: 6098 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 08:41:30
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

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

Correspondence ID: 6099 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 08:41:30
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
 The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
 Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
 Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
 Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Correspondence ID: 6100 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 08:41:30
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
 The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
 Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
 Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
 Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Correspondence ID: 6101 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 08:41:35
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: 6102 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 08:41:35
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: 6103 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 08:41:35
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: 6104 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 08:41:35
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: 6105 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 00:00:00**Correspondence Type:** Web Form**Correspondence:** As a tax payer and naturalist I am deeply concerned about the impact of off road vehicles on our beaches, wildlife and recreation opportunities. Access by ORV's should be limited not only because of habitat destruction, but because they ruin the experience for those of us who enjoy what should be a peaceful get away from our busy schedules. I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: 6106 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y**Name:** private**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00**Correspondence Type:** Web Form**Correspondence:** I value the parks and appreciate the multi-use logic ... but please take a stand to preserve the wildness and wild life .. Im 72 and am thinking of the heritage left to later generations. Knowing these protected areas exist is as great a satisfaction as using them.

I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: 6107 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y**Name:** private**Received:** May,07,2010 08:41:41**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: 6108 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y**Name:** private**Received:** May,07,2010 08:41:41**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: 6109 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May.07,2010 08:41:41

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: 6110 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May.07,2010 08:41:42

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: 6111 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May.07,2010 08:41:47

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: 6112 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 08:43:07
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: 6113 **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 very important to me.
The following principles should be the foundation of the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Please Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: One of the alternatives (F) that has been suggested is to reserve only 16 of the park's 68 miles for year-round non-ORV use. This does not maintain a balanced space for the variety of park users. I would encourage you to consider allocating at least half of the beach (approximately 34 miles or more) to year-round non-ORV use (ORV prohibited) to allow visitors to have plenty of safe space in which to enjoy the park and also to allow a safe environment for the wildlife of this area to be naturally replenished and restored.
* Put Natural Resources First. As I mentioned above, it is important that protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. It would be a travesty to future generations if it could be said that recreational use of this area caused any species of wildlife to become endangered.
* 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 for current and future generations to enjoy.

Correspondence ID: 6114 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 08:43:14
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.

EVERY SPECIES IS PART OF OUR LIFE CYCLE. WITHOUT BIODIVERSITY WE ARE ALSO DOOMED TO EXTINCTION.

Correspondence ID: 6115 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 08:43:14
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: 6116 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 08:43:14
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: 6117 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 08:43:14
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: 6118 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 08:43:15
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: 6119 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 08:43:15
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: 6120 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 08:43:15
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: 6121 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 08:43:21
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: 6122 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 08:43:32
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: 6123 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 08:43:32
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: 6124 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 08:43:32
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: 6125 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 08:43:32
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: 6126 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 08:43:33
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: 6127 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 08:43:33
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: 6128 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 08:43:41
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: 6129 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 08:43:41
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.
It is inconceivable to me that there is any doubt about using the alternative 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. Human irresponsibility has got to stop. Stop it here and now.

Correspondence ID: 6130 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 08:43:48
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: 6131 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 08:43:48
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
I have read another land use plan for the seashore. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 6132 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 08:43:48
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: 6133 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 08:43:54
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: 6134 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 08:43:54
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: 6135 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 08:43:54
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: 6136 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 08:43:55
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: 6137 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 08:43:55
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: 6138 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 08:44:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

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

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

Correspondence ID: 6139 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 08:44:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 6140 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 08:44:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 6141 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 08:45:12
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: This island is our favourite place to visit because of Kiteboarding. We have been there 13 times and spent over \$10,000 supporting the local shops and vacation properties. If they stop kiteboarding there, there is no reason to ever come back.
I can honestly speak on behalf of hundreds of kiteboarding families.
Mark Does

Correspondence ID: 6142 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Anderson, Peter N
Received: May,07,2010 08:52:34
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: As an avid angler on the 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. Respectfully, Pete Anderson, CPT USA

Correspondence ID: 6143 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:10:22
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Sea turtles have enough trouble in the sea with boat propellers hitting their shells. They need help just getting to the sea. I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Correspondence ID: 6144 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:10:22
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: 6145 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:10:23
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Correspondence ID: 6146 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:10:23
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Correspondence ID: 6147 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:10:23
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Correspondence ID: 6148 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:10:23
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Correspondence ID: 6149 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:10:25
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: 6150 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May.07.2010 09:10:28
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: 6151 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May.07.2010 09:10:28
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: 6152 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May.07.2010 09:10:28
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: 6153 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I have vacationed a few times over in Cape Hatteras and I too have driven on the sand before and had a wonderful time. At the time I noticed a few red taped areas marked for turtles and other endangered wildlife and I didn't have a problem not off-roading in those areas. In fact, it didn't take away from my holiday experience at all. I even signed a petition to help the wildlife while I was there.
The only people I notice that were angry were the locals. I listened well because at the time we were thinking of moving to the area. It seemed to me one on side of their mouth they were complaining about having their rights taken away, but from the other side they were proud of all the wildlife in the area and how awesome "their" beaches were.
There really should be a year round plan that would help the wildlife and some enforcement of the off-road vehicles. Everyone will benefit from this - vacationers, future generations, wildlife and yes even locals. Because once they see their wildlife gone and "their" beaches ruined, they will be oh so sorry and wish they had not protested so much to this plan.
I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Correspondence ID: 6154 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:10:28
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: 6155 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:10:29
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: 6156 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:10:34
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: 6157 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:10:34
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.
As a resident of North Carolina, I care deeply about our native wildlife and plant life. So I greatly urge you to insure the safety of both.

Correspondence ID: 6158 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:10:34
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: 6159 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 09:10:39
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: 6160 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:10:39
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: 6161 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:10:40
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
 The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
 Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
 Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
 Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Correspondence ID: 6162 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:10:45
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: 6163 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:10:45
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: 6164 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:10:45
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: 6165 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:10:45
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: 6166 **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: 6167 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:10:50
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: 6168 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:10:50
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: 6169 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:10:50
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: 6170 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: On the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore, I support Alternative D if it is modified to provide greater pedestrian access, an alternative that was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred. The Alternative D plan would provide for more non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, uses that are important to me.
Regardless of the alternative chosen, the following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan:
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach, an unfair balance for other users and wildlife. At least one-half of the beach should be available to non-ORV users and wildlife year round.
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should be the first priority. Recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan does not set aside adequate areas free of year-round ORV to ensure wildlife breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Protection of wildlife must be based on the best scientific information available.
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan should ensure clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. The management targets in the DEIS need more thorough vetting that is based on the Seashore's potential to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not recovering as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures need to be implemented until recovery goals are met.
Our wildlife is precious. ORV use is not essential to life on the planet and our survival.

Correspondence ID: 6171 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:10:51
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.
***** There is NO reason to have ORVs on the beaches !!!!

Correspondence ID: 6172 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:10:51
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Living as I do on property that is trespassed upon and adversely impacted by ORVs, I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating,

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

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

Correspondence ID: 6173 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:10:56
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: 6174 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:10:56
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: 6175 **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 protect our world and wildlife. I keep begging our Govt. and the people in charge to be kind and help all our wildlife creatures and I don't understand why this is so difficult to do. Hurting and killing or not protecting little creatures in need seems to cruel an inhumane so please save our world and protect it. thank you Joyce Yore

Correspondence ID: 6176 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:10:56
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: 6177 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:10:56
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: 6178 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:10:56
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: 6179 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:11:01
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: 6180 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:11:02
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Regarding National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
 The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
 Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
 Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
 Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Correspondence ID: 6181 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:11:02
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: 6182 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:11:02
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: 6183 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I have spent many days vacationing on North Carolina's barrier islands, including the Cape Hatteras National Seashore on the Outer Banks. I take my family there and spend our tourist dollars to enjoy outdoor recreation and wildlife such as sea turtles and shorebirds. Therefore, I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Correspondence ID: 6184 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:11:12
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: 6185 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:11:14
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: 6186 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:11:16
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: 6187 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:11:19
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: 6188 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:11:21
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: 6189 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: While I agree that NC's long shoreline requires a paved road for convenient travel along the Outer Banks, having been there numerous times I KNOW that no area of the Outer Banks is so far from the one main paved road that access is prohibited if ORVs are banned. Visitors to the Outer Banks can park along the shoulder of the main paved road & walk through the sand dunes to the surf. Restricting motorized vehicles is better for the visitors AND the wildlife.
I do not want motorized vehicles speeding noisily past my family as we sunbathe, picnic or stroll on the beach.

There are many handicap-access areas, so that is not a reason for ORVs either.
M.M.

I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: 6190 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May.07.2010 00:00:00
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. Should the Hateras seashore escape impact from the on-going Gulf oil spill, it will be of even more importance to the viability of many species affected by the spill. Limiting the degradation caused by ORVs is of even more importance because of the spill.

I support Alternative D, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative, if modified to provide greater pedestrian 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.

If the Park Service chooses an alternative other than D, three principals should nevertheless be of primary importance: Equal Access for All Visitors, Natural Resources First, and, most important, Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery Established and Met.

For example, under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed at all within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Pedestrians could enjoy a more natural, vehicle-free experience.

All recreational use should be consistent with protection of wildlife as a primary goal and that protection must be based on sound science. 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 disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

The management targets in the DEIS, need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where annual reviews indicate that birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as anticipated additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are 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 service to protect our natural resources.

Correspondence ID: 6191 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May.07.2010 09:11:33
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: 6192 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May.07.2010 09:11:33
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: 6193 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:11:38
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: 6194 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:11:38
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: 6195 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:11:39
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: 6196 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:11:40
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Correspondence ID: 6197 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:11:40
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Correspondence ID: 6198 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:11:41
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: 6199 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:11:41
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: 6200 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:11:46
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: 6201 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:11:46
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: 6202 **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.

However, my true preference would be to prohibit ALL vehicular traffic with the exception of scooters used by the handicapped. It would also, of course, include the use of necessary Park Service vehicles.

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: 6203 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:11:46
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: 6204 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:11:46
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: 6205 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:11:46
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: 6206 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 09:11:46
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: 6207 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:11:51
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: 6208 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:11:51
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: 6209 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:11:51
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: 6210 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:11:51
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: 6211 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:11:57
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: 6212 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:11:57
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: 6213 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:11:57
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: 6214 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:11:57
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: 6215 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:12:02
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: 6216 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:12:02
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: 6217 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:12:02
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: 6218 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:13:10
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: 6219 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:13:10
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: 6220 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:13:10
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: 6221 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:13:10
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: 6222 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:13:10
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: 6223 **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 native North Carolinian and transplant to Florida, I have seen first hand how ORVs can damage the landscape and impact imperiled species. ORV usage, in most cases, is NOT an environmentally conscious recreational activity and should be avoided in the natural areas we have left in this country. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
 The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
 *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
 * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
 * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 6224 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:13:10
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: 6225 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:13:17
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: 6226 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 09:13:17

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: 6227 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 09:13:17

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: 6228 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 09:13:17

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: 6229 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:13:17

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: 6230 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:13:17

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: 6231 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:13:17

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: 6232 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 09:13:17

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: 6233 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 09:13:17

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: 6234 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 09:13:27

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: 6235 **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.

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: 6236 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 09:13:27

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: 6237 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 09:13:27

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: 6238 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:13:27

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: 6239 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:13:27

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: 6240 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:13:27

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: 6241 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:13:27
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: 6242 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:13:27
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: 6243 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:13:32
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: 6244 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:13:32

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: 6245 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:13:32

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: 6246 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:13:32

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: 6247 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:13:32

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: 6248 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:13:33

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: 6249 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:13:39

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: 6250 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:13:39
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: 6251 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:13:39
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: 6252 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:13:39
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: 6253 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:13:39

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: 6254 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:13:39

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: 6255 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:13:39

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: 6256 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:13:39

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: 6257 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:13:47

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: 6258 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:13:47

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: 6259 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:13:47

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: 6260 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:13:47

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: 6261 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:13:47

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: 6262 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:13:47
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: 6263 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:13:55
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: 6264 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:13:56
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: 6265 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:13:56

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: 6266 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:13:58

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: 6267 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:14:01

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: 6268 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 09:14:01

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: 6269 **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. As someone who relies on regular visits to the seashore for inspiration and rejuvenation of mind and spirit, I know how necessary it is to be able to rely on those in positions of authority to protect and shelter the many wonderful lifeforms that have their homes there. Please do all you can to preserve their natural habitat.

Correspondence ID: 6270 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 09:14:01

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: 6271 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:14:01
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: 6272 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:14:01
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: 6273 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:14:01
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: 6274 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:14:01
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: 6275 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:14:07
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: 6276 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:14:07
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: 6277 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:14:07
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: 6278 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:14:07
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: 6279 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:14:07
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: 6280 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:14:07
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: 6281 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:14:07
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: 6282 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:14:13
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: 6283 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:14:13
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: 6284 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:14:13
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: 6285 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:14:13
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: 6286 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:14:13
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: 6287 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:14:13
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: 6288 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:14:16
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: 6289 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:14:19
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: 6290 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:14:19
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: 6291 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:14:19
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: 6292 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:14:19
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: 6293 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:14:19
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: 6294 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:14:20
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 turtles.

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

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

Correspondence ID: 6295 **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.

There are visitors who come from all over the country and the world to see wildlife and relax and regain their health at Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The unruly ORV riders should not be allowed to dominate. They mean to destroy the habitats of birds who are truly more important than they are - and the ORV riders CAN learn respect. They don't know what they are doing and they must learn.

Please keep your plan to protect wildlife and birds for visitors and beach goers like us.

My husband and I did not like this on the island of Kauai once when we were bathing with ORV riders who didn't understand and that is amazing as they were young - a word of what a birder was. My husband and I are birders and nature lovers who spend good money to see nature. We weren't always this way. We have learned a lot from the Audubon!

We demand to be considered.

People don't know what is in their best interest and for their health. Tell them.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,
Carolyn Straub Steve McHenry San Jose, CA

Correspondence ID: 6296 **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.

With the most recent of ravages against sea and seashore animals, we must try our best to work to preserve those animals that we can now. We can not afford to keep saying this is an issue for later, as later has arrived and it is now. I sincerely hope that you feel this way at this important point in time.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: 6297 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 09:14:26

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: 6298 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 09:14:26

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: 6299 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 09:14:26

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: 6300 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 09:14:26
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: 6301 **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. Also, I hate the noise, the rude drivers who rip up the flora and endanger wildlife of all kinds. They are selfish, not caring whether they maim or kill anything, endangered or not. Personally, I'd like them permanently and completely banned.
 The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
 *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
 * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
 * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 6302 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:14:26
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: 6303 **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 used to live in Huntington Beach, California, and the wildlife estuary was in dire trouble. I was eager to participate in the rehabilitation and recovery efforts that took years to implement. The area is now thriving and the beach across Pacific Coast Hwy. has not suffered for the changes in the path of the highway and the protection of the endangered species in the area. It can work for everyone if done properly. PLEASE consider the importance of the wildlife - we can all survive together when good research, thought and implementation go hand in hand.
Thank you!

Correspondence ID: 6304 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May.07.2010 09:14:31
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.
Please take these measures now before it is too late. I want my children and grand children to enjoy God's creations as we much as we have. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 6305 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May.07.2010 09:14:32
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: 6306 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:14:32
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: 6307 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:14:32
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: 6308 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:14:32
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.

as breeding ones.

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

Correspondence ID: 6309 **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. The only use if ORV use is for emergency staff use. If any 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. Protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
Establish Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery.
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: 6310 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May.07.2010 09:14:32
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: 6311 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May.07.2010 09:14:32
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: 6312 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May.07.2010 09:14:32
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: 6313 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 09:14:37

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: 6314 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 09:14:37

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: 6315 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 09:14:37

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: 6316 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 09:14:37

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: 6317 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 09:14:37

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: 6318 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 09:14:37

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: 6319 **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.

No one, no individual is being kept out of our National Park; anyone may still enter, but for the sake of our natural resources, leave the ORVs at the gate.

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: 6320 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:14:37

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

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

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

Our bird and marine sealife need all the protected habitat they can get after the oil slick disaster that is threatening wildlife habitat in the Gulf Coast waters and estuaries.

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

Correspondence ID: 6321 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:14:43

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: 6322 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:14:43
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: 6323 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:14:43
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: 6324 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:14:43
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: 6325 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:14:43
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: 6326 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:14:43
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: 6327 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:14:43
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: 6328 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:14:49
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: 6329 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:14:49
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: 6330 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:14:49
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: 6331 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:14:50
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: 6332 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:14:50
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: 6333 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:14:50
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: 6334 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 09:14:50

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. == I spent a few summers on the Seashore -- and still hold very fond memories -- and lessons learned -- from those childhood experiences. Future generations should also have that opportunity!

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

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: 6335 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 09:14:51

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: 6336 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 09:14:56

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: 6337 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 09:14:56

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: 6338 **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.

A couple of years ago, I was boating on one of the back bays in South Jersey. I noticed several Little Terns circling above a sandy area in the wetland. Upon approaching closer, I noticed a group of young men who were motorcycle stunt riding in the area. We beached the boat and went ashore. I stopped the bikers and pointed out that they were riding among the nesting Terns. We discovered that they had killed several of the nestlings (an endangered species in NJ.) The boys were shocked and horrified that they had caused so much damage. It is nearly impossible to see the nests or the tiny chicks, who blend into the environment so well that you need to get on hands and knees to see them (if then!) We helped the boys pick their way back out of the nesting area, and sent them on their way. One afternoon of play essentially destroyed the efforts of the colony that year.

You, literally, cannot avoid damaging the birds' nesting while crawling on your hands and knees. Seven feet up in an SUV at 30 mph, the ORV people are totally unaware of the damage they are causing. I doubt they have any clue.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: 6339 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 09:14:56

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: 6340 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 09:14:56

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: 6341 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 09:15:01

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: 6342 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 09:15:02

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: 6343 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 09:15:02

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: 6344 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 09:15:02

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: 6345 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 09:15:08

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: 6346 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 09:15:08

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: 6347 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 09:15:08

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: 6348 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 09:15:08

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: 6349 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 09:15:08

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: 6350 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 09:15:08

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: 6351 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 09:15:08

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: 6352 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 09:15:10

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: 6353 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 09:15:14

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: 6354 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 09:15:14

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: 6355 **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 unreasonable and irresponsible to put ORV use above the use of pedestrians and, of at least equal if not greater importance, the nesting, breeding, and survival of the wildlife that absolutely depend upon this particular habitat for their very existence.

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

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

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

* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until 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 nation, we must set an example for others to copy with regard for protection of the many species, both native and migratory, that will not survive if our government does not realize the value of wildlife above the use of ORV's. ORV users have plenty of alternatives. Wildlife that depend upon this particular habitat do not have such alternatives.

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

Correspondence ID: 6356 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 09:15:14

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: 6357 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May.07.2010 09:15:14

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: 6358 **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 sick and tired of ORV users damaging the environment and preventing enjoyment of parks by those who want to bird watch and enjoy peace and quiet. There is no place for ORVs on beaches when birds and animals are nesting or laying eggs particularly if they are rare, threatened or endangered species. A vocal minority's wishes should not take precedence over the majority of users. Sections of the beach should also prohibit ORV use year round.

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: 6359 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May.07.2010 09:15:20

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: 6360 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:15:20
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: 6361 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:15:20
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: 6362 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:15:20
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: 6363 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:15:20
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: 6364 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:15:20
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.
Pat Sawhney, a lover of wildlife

Correspondence ID: 6365 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:15:20
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: 6366 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May.07.2010 09:15:20
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: 6367 **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 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.
I will never understand the need of people to go to fragile natural areas and take vehicles with them. ORV use (while it should be allowed in certain places) is generally totally incompatible with wildlife and with other human use.
This is an unfortunate case where the needs of a small minority of users often unfairly outweighs the benefits to other users and to wildlife and habitat. I do believe that education is an excellent way to make people understand restrictions and necessary limited use of these areas by vehicles.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 6368 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May.07.2010 09:15:27
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are

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

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

Correspondence ID: 6369 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:15:27
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 6370 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:15:27
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 6371 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:15:27
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are

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

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

Correspondence ID: 6372 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:15:27
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 6373 **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. This is especially important given the possible adverse effect on shore life given the oil spill. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 6374 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:15:27
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are

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

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

Correspondence ID: 6375 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:15:27
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 6376 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:15:28
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: 6377 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:15:32
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are

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

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

Correspondence ID: 6378 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:15:33
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: 6379 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:15:33
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: 6380 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:15:33
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: 6381 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:15:33
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: 6382 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:15:33
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.
Noise and ORV use is stressful and disturbing to people and wildlife. Even when a person does not report any stress from noise, raised levels of stress hormones are usually present. These stress hormones have adverse affects on the heard. Scientific literature exists to support this statement. The Noise & Health Journal is a good source of details regarding human health and noise.
Noise and the disturbances from ORV drive non-motorized users away from an area as well as destroying wildlife habitat and blindly risking birds nests and ground-nesting birds.
Aesthetically National Parks should strive for natural soundscapes. Healthwise, they should encourage people to get out and walk. Environmentally, they should discourage the use of fossil-fuel burning, noise spewing, vegetation and wildlife destroying ORVs.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 6383 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:15:34
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. As an avid surfcaster and regular visitor to Cape Cod and Cape Hatteras, I am hopeful that the NPS will protect our fragile beaches from motorized traffic. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 6384 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:15:39
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: 6385 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:15:39
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: 6386 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:15:40
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.

0010651

Correspondence ID: 6387 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:15:40
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: 6388 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:15:40
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: 6389 **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 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: 6390 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:15:45
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: 6391 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:15:45
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: 6392 **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 particular Off Road Vehicles need to be prohibited in a larger area of the beach. Great Buffer areas. Greater protective measures to insure species return for breeding, migration and wintering.
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well

as breeding ones.

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

Correspondence ID: 6393 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:15:46
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: 6394 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:15:46
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: 6395 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:15:48
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: 6396 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:15:52
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: 6397 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:15:52
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: 6398 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:15:52
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.

as breeding ones.

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

Correspondence ID: 6399 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May.07.2010 09:15:52
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.
 I've never been to Cape Hatteras myself (yet) but I'm a true beach lover since childhood. I think it is very sad that this lovely area should be threatened by a small minority of people who insist that it is their right to destroy, to the detriment of the rest of us.
 This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
 The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
 *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
 * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
 * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 6400 **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.
 If the park does not choose to enact Alternative D, I believe the following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan:
 *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year-round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year-round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could 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 have first priority, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year-round for wildlife, including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums, and they should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
 * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 6401 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May.07.2010 09:15:52
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: 6402 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:15:52
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: 6403 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:15:52
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: 6404 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:15:58
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: 6405 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:15:58
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: 6406 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:15:58
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: 6407 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:15:58
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: 6408 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:15:58
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: 6409 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:16:04
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: 6410 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:16:04
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: 6411 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:16:04
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: 6412 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:16:04
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: 6413 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:16:04
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: 6414 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:16:04
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: 6415 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:16:04
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: 6416 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:16:04
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: 6417 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:16:04
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: 6418 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:16:10
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: 6419 **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. FIRST, second, third,,,and only then consider adding ORVs to the mixed use in a separated portion so wildlife and quiet users aren't harmed. Recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are 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. We need a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of

the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 6420 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:16:10
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: 6421 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:16:10
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: 6422 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:16:10
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: 6423 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:16:10
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.
It should be your PRIMARY responsibility to protect the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore than to enable a small portion of our population to run their toys anywhere they please.
Our National Park Service should be trying to protect our parks and our natural areas for future generations of wildlife and people. Your management should protect migrating and wintering species as well as breeding species
SAVE OUR NATURAL AREAS---THOSE THAT ARE STILL LEFT.
Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 6424 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:16:10
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: 6425 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:16:16
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: 6426 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:16:16
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: 6427 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:16:16
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: 6428 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:16:16
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: 6429 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:16:17
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: 6430 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 09:16:16

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: 6431 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 09:16:17

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.

Vehicles do not belong on a beach! They are dangerous to pedestrians, especially children. See our documentaries at safebeachanddunes.org.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: 6432 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 09:16:17

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: 6433 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 09:16:22

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: 6434 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 09:16:22

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: 6435 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 09:16:22

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: 6436 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 09:16:22

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: 6437 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 09:16:22

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. As a visitor to Cape Hatteras I am very interested in seeing it well managed for future generations.

Correspondence ID: 6438 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 09:16:22

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.

I concur completely with the position of the National Audubon Society regarding the banning of ORVs on part of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore. If we don't do that then soon all we will have is a play ground for 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:	6439	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,07,2010 09:16:22						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	<p>I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.</p> <p>This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.</p> <p>The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:</p> <p>*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.</p> <p>* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.</p> <p>* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.</p>						

Correspondence ID:	6440	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,07,2010 09:16:28						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	<p>I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.</p> <p>This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.</p> <p>The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:</p> <p>*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.</p> <p>* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.</p> <p>* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.</p>						

Correspondence ID:	6441	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,07,2010 00:00:00						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	<p>I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.</p>						

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which is supremely important to me. There should be some places where it is quiet and safe for our wildlife - we are rapidly diminishing the amount of space for them. Humans are very arrogant to think that they can go anywhere with their machines regardless of the repercussions, be they environmental or not. I believe that we need to protect our open spaces for all, not just for one group of humans. Wildlife contributes to the quality of lives and to the proper working of nature - which we too often forget. We need to stand up for those who cannot speak for themselves. At the VERY least, the final plan should provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent any semblance of a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least 80% of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: 6442 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 09:16:28

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: 6443 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 09:16:28

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: 6444 **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.

We are reminded, given the current disaster on the Gulf Coast, of how fragile are the habitats for wildlife. And how we need to strengthen and protect them wherever possible.

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

*Equal Access for All Visitors. In the NPS 'preferred' plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach, an unfair balance for other users and wildlife. If RV use is allowed in the park, please make at least half the beach available year-round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Then add more walkways and better access facilities to provide balanced access for all, letting pedestrians and families more safely enjoy the Seashore, and giving wildlife a chance to rebound to traditional numbers and diversity here.

* Put Natural Resources First. Protecting the Seashore's natural resources and wildlife should come first; keep recreational use consistent with this protection. The preferred plan does not make enough full-time areas free of ORV use for wildlife, for the breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Please base wildlife protection on the best scientific information. Also, increase buffers to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

* Establish and Meet Clear Goals & Milestones for Wildlife Recovery. The management targets in the DEIS need more thorough vetting based on the Seashore's potential to support wildlife, not on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, add in protective measures until recovery goals are met. Such effective changes should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

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

Correspondence ID: 6445 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:16:28
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: 6446 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:16:28
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: 6447 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:16:34
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: 6448 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 09:16:34

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: 6449 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 09:16:34

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 issue is very important to me. I support Alternative D and urge you to do 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: 6450 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 09:16:34

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: 6451 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 09:16:34

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: 6452 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 09:16:34

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: 6453 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 09:16:34

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: 6454 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 09:16:39

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: 6455 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 09:16:39

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: 6456 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 09:16:39

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: 6457 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 09:16:39

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: 6458 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 09:16:40

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: 6459 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 09:16:40

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: 6460 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 09:16:40

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: 6461 **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. This is so important to me. The disparity between recreation and wildlife use is intolerable.

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: 6462 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 09:16:45

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: 6463 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 09:16:45

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: 6464 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 09:16:45

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: 6465 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 09:16:45

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: 6466 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 09:16:45

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: 6467 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 09:16:45

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: 6468 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 09:16:50

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: 6469 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 09:16:50

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: 6470 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 09:16:50

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: 6471 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 09:16:50

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: 6472 **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 priorities are, first, to decrease disturbance of wildlife, and secondly, to provide increased opportunities for non-users of OFVs. These are both satisfied by the alternative plan.

If the park does not select Alternative D, I hope it will nonetheless adhere to the following principles.

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: 6473 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 09:16:55

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: 6474 **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.

The Cape Hatteras seashore is a treasure that should be enjoyed by all. It's everyone's responsibility to leave the shore better than they found it so future generations will be able to enjoy as well. It's up to you to adopt policies that manage this resource in such a way that it exists indefinitely and is not consumed by any one group of users.

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

Correspondence ID: 6475 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y**Name:** private**Received:** May,07,2010 09:16:56**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: 6476 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y**Name:** private**Received:** May,07,2010 09:16:56**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: 6477 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:16:56
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: 6478 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:17:01
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: 6479 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:17:01
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: 6480 **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.
 To whom it may concern:
 I can't believe that an 87% decline in the colonial bird population at the Cape isn't enough to mandate strict regulations in order to preserve these birds AND IN A TEN YEAR SPAN THIS HAS HAPPENED...and then there are the turtles AND OTHER WILDLIFE. Also the behavior of the off road vehicle drivers/users is enough to limit those who would love to visit and enjoy the NATURAL WONDERS of Cape Hatteras. Simple science should tell the story and be the final arbiter of your decisions
 This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
 The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
 *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
 * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
 * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 6481 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:17:01
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: 6482 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:17:01
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.

In Washington and Oregon, nesting areas for Snowy Plovers are protected from the adverse effects of vehicle traffic. Obviously, it is time to implement protection for bird species on the East Coast also.

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

Correspondence ID: 6483 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:17:01
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: 6484 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:17:01
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: 6485 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:17:03
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: 6486 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:17:06
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: 6487 **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, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year-round on 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Pedestrians and families could then enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to recover numbers and diversity within the park.
* Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should be highest of priorities. The preferred plan fails to guard adequate areas free of ORV use year-round for breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife-disturbance buffers should be increased to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
*A plan must include clear purpose and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not reviving as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until they do so. These objectives, and the means to realize them, should guard migrating and wintering species as well as breeding.

Correspondence ID: 6488 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:17:07
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: 6489 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:17:07

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: 6490 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 09:17:07

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: 6491 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 09:17:07

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: 6492 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 09:17:07

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: 6493 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 09:17:12

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: 6494 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 09:17:13

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: 6495 **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. As someone who made frequent vacations to this beautiful spot while growing up, I have many fond memories dipping into the ocean and enjoying the beach wildlife and habitat. As a young child, I felt it's wildness. Thank you again for the opportunity to share in my concerns for the Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Sincerely, Susan Setterlin

Correspondence ID: 6496 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 09:17:13

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: 6497 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 09:17:13

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: 6498 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private
Received: May.07.2010 09:17:13
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: 6499 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May.07.2010 09:17:13
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: 6500 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May.07.2010 09:17:13
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: 6501 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private
Received: May.07.2010 09:17:18
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: 6502 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May.07.2010 09:17:18
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: 6503 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May.07.2010 09:17:18
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: 6504 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:17:18
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: 6505 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:17:18
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: 6506 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:17:18
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: 6507 **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. ORV's have provoked outrage throughout our country. I feel that they should be banned everywhere except on public roads! In my extensive travels I have seen countless landscapes and countryside ruined by these monstrosities, and I and my family would be deeply appreciative if you would ban them entirely from the National Seashore. Individuals who ride ORV's in such places are completely selfish and care nothing for the places they ride them in.
 The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
 *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
 * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
 * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 6508 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:17:18
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: 6509 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:17:18
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: 6510 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:17:19
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: 6511 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:17:24
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: 6512 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:17:24
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: 6513 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:17:24
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: 6514 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:17:24
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: 6515 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:17:24
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: 6516 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:17:24
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: 6517 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:17:24
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: 6518 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:17:24
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: 6519 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:17:25
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: 6520 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:17:30
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: 6521 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:17:30
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: 6522 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 09:17:30

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.

I am saddened by how we have such little respect for animal/bird life. I think its time we honor such creatures and protect them in their natural habitat. Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 6523 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 09:17:30

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: 6524 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 09:17:30

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: 6525 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:17:30
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: 6526 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:17:30
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: 6527 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:17:31
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: 6528 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:17:35
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: 6529 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:17:35
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: 6530 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:17:36
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: 6531 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:17:36
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: 6532 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:17:36
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: 6533 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:17:36
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: 6534 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:17:36
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: 6535 **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 (for a change). Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 6536 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:17:41
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: 6537 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:17:41
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: 6538 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:17:41
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: 6539 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:17:41
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: 6540 **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.
SAFE IS THE WORD FOR WILDLIFE AND PEOPLE- I WAS ON A BEACH IN TEXAS WHEN A SMALL CHILD RAN OUT AND WAS HIT BY A CAR- WE HAVE ROADS AND HIGHWAYS FOR DRIVING WE AND THE WILDLIFE NEED PEACE AND QUIET ON OUR BEACHES AND IN OUR PARKS. THESE VEHICLES BRING ROAD DEBRIS WITH THEM ONTO THE BEACHES. OUR WILDLIFE CANNOT SURVIVE IF THEY DO NOT HAVE AREAS FREE OF VEHICLE USE. PLEASE DO NOT FORGET THAT THERE IS ALCOHOL INVOLVED IN THIS ORV ENDEAVOR. THE MAJORITY OF PEOPLE IN THE US DO NOT BELONG TO AN ORV GROUP. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 6541 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:17:41
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: 6542 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:17:41
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: 6543 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:17:41
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 considerations to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 6544 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:17:46
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: 6545 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:17:46
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: 6546 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:17:46
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: 6547 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:17:46
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: 6548 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:17:46
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: 6549 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:17:46
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: 6550 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:17:46
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: 6551 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:17:47
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: 6552 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:17:52
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: 6553 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:17:52
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: 6554 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:17:52
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: 6555 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:17:53
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: 6556 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:17:53
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: 6557 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:17:53
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: 6558 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:17:53
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: 6559 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:17:53
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: 6560 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:17:53
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: 6561 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:17:58
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: 6562 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:17:58
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: 6563 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:17:58
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: 6564 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:17:58
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: 6565 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:17:58
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: 6566 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:17:58
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: 6567 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:17:58
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: 6568 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:18:04
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: 6569 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:18:04
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, all of which is important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until 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 needs of endangered/threatened species should be foremost in all of your decisions.

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

Correspondence ID: 6570 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:18:04
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: 6571 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:18:04
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: 6572 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:18:04
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: 6573 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:18:04
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: 6574 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:18:09
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 6575 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:18:09
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

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

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

Correspondence ID: 6576 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:18:09
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 6577 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:18:09
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
Natural habitats suffer from the noise and pollution from ORVs, and they should not be allowed in these sensitive areas.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 6578 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:18:09
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: 6579 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:18:09
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 6580 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:18:09
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 6581 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:18:09
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: 6582 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:18:09
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 6583 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:18:15
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: 6584 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:18:15
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: 6585 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:18:15
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: 6586 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:18:15
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: 6587 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:18:15
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: 6588 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:18:20
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: 6589 **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 this beautiful place and ORV add nothing to it. Careless ORV users destroy habitat and wildlife, There are precious few wild places left and this is one that needs maximum protection. Pleasure ORV users have plenty of places to go besides here. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least 3/4 of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. ORV users have other places to go, wildlife is captive and rapidly diminishing. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
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.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 6590 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:18:20
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: 6591 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:18:20

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: 6592 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:18:20

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: 6593 **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.

Alternative D provides for minimal disturbance to wildlife in the Cape Hatteras National Seashore. This is particularly important as wildlife on a seashore is impacted by the oil spill disaster on the Gulf Coast.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: 6594 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:18:21
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: 6595 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:18:21
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.
Actually I prefer Alt. D, whether or not greater pedestrian access is incorporated into it.
You will see the excellent points that will be made by others taking this opportunity to contact you. I'll just point out that as a user of beaches I am impressed that wheeled vehicle recreationists have been little restricted. OHVers are organized and the active members tend to be negotiable when faced with vocal publics that have significant concerns with their activities. They are less collaborative when they think decibels will win their interests. While they are a valid user group of public lands, their influence both on the ground and in policy-setting halls is far out of proportion to their numbers. Because of their habitat destructiveness and unwelcome noise and threat to pedestrian safety, if expanded ORV use were to be put to a vote to all citizens, the ORVers would lose. Thus if fear of political repercussion is present, try to recall that ORVers are a minority.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 6596 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:18:21
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: 6597 **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 establishing a final plan for Cape Hatteras, the Park Service must follow law and science in guaranteeing adequate space and protections for wildlife. The Park Service can do so while still allowing responsible beach driving in some areas so that all visitors can fully enjoy this national treasure. The final rules should improve public access to the beaches for pedestrians and people with disabilities by adding boardwalks, parking spaces, and public facilities to enhance visitor enjoyment in balance with wildlife conservation efforts.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 6598 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:18:26
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.
Wildlife need a safe haven. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 6599 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:18:26
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: 6600 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:18:26
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: 6601 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:18:26
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: 6602 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:18:26
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: 6603 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:18:26
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.

Capt. Joel S. Fogel Chairman, Environmental Affairs The Explorers Club (www.explorers.org)

Co-Chairman, Eco Tourism NJ Tourism Council (www.actourism.org)

President, WATERWATCH International www.waterwatchinternational.org

Correspondence ID: 6604 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:18:33
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 6605 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:18:33
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 6606 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:18:33
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to

me.

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

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: 6607 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:18:33
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 6608 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:18:33
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 6609 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:18:33
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
As a concerned American citizen and taxpayer I strongly feel that the alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches

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

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

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: 6610 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:18:33
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 6611 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:18:33
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 6612 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:18:33
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and reduce disturbance of the wildlife that I so love and value.

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

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: 6613 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:18:38

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: 6614 **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: 6615 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:18:38

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: 6616 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:18:38

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

Correspondence ID: 6617 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:18:38

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: 6618 **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.

WE GO TO THIS SEA SHORE, CAPE HATTERAS, TWICE A YEAR, MY FAMILY HAS A COTTAGE THERE. WE HAVE BEEN GOING SINCE THE 1970'S. THERE IS QUITE A BIT OF CONTROVERSY AND IT HAS BEEN ONGOING FOR YEARS. ORV'S HAVE TO SHARE THE SEA SHORE USE WITH OTHER LIFE, LIKE PEOPLE AND ANIMALS WHO LIVE ON THIS EARTH TOO. A NON ORV SECTION IS A FAIR WAY OF SHARING WITH ALL INVOLVED. NOBODY COULD OR SHOULD HAVE IT ALL.

Correspondence ID: 6619 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:18:38
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: 6620 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:18:44
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: 6621 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:18:44
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: 6622 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:18:44
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: 6623 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:18:44
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: 6624 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:18:44
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.
It makes no sense to use natural areas, with rare and endangered species, for vehicular traffic. ORV are not necessary for anything but fun. Let ORV go where they are not destroying what can't be rebuilt.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: 6625 **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.
FOLLOWING THE CATASTROPHIC OIL SPILL IN THE GULF OF MEXICO, NESTING BIRDS REQUIRE MORE PROTECTION THAN EVER IN OTHER COASTAL AREAS. BANNING ORVS WOULD ALSO ELIMINATE A TOTALLY WASTEFUL AND UNNECESSARY USE OF GASOLINE, LESSENING THE NEED FOR DRILLING AND IMPORTING OIL.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 6626 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:18:44
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: 6627 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:18:49
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: 6628 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:18:49
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 6629 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:18:49
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 6630 **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.
Please protect the wildlife more. at Cape Hatteras. Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 6631 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:18:50
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.

Knowing that issues such as this are rarely completely black and white, I feel that this issue is. The potential to lose any of our precious resources in favor of "entertaining" a small segment of our population is not a cost that any of us should be willing to accept.

Please do whatever you can to protect the Cape Hatteras National Seashore, both in the case of this issue and any future issues.

Thank you again for allowing me to comment.

John Chatsworth

Correspondence ID: 6632 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:18:50
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: 6633 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:18:50
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: 6634 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:18:55
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: 6635 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:18:55
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: 6636 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:18:55
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: 6637 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:18:55
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: 6638 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:18:55
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: 6639 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:18:55
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.. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 6640 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:18:55
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: 6641 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:19:01
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: 6642 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:19:02
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 6643 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:19:02
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are

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

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

Correspondence ID: 6644 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:19:02
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 6645 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:19:02
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 6646 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:19:02
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are

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

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

Correspondence ID: 6647 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:19:03
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: 6648 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:19:03
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: 6649 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:19:07
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: 6650 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:19:07
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. As we all know it is a magical place that deserves our respect and conservation.

Correspondence ID: 6651 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:19:07
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: 6652 **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 personally do not believe ORV belong in any National Park or Seashore! If your department believes that these vehicles must be allowed; they should be restricted to a small area, like a parking lot. Those of us who drive cars do not think we should be allowed off road to enjoy disrupting and destroying nature! I don't think "access" means being able to drive ORV up and down the beaches. It means being able to get into the area.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
The number one priority must be protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore. Any recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent

degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

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

Correspondence ID: 6653 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:19:07
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: 6654 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:19:07
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: 6655 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:19:08
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: 6656 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:19:08
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: 6657 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:19:08
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: 6658 **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,
I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding,

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: 6659 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:19:13

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: 6660 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:19:13

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: 6661 **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 nature lover and beach lover, I appreciate unspoiled beaches, free from motorized vehicles. As do the creatures that live and breed and nest there, and other people enjoying the sea shore. I am personally opposed to driving on beaches at all, but realize that public access to federal lands must accommodate multiple types of access. But within reason, please. Off-road vehicles cause a lot of damage to sensitive oceanside biomes. I encourage you to choose the management alternative that protects the most land for wildlife and non-ORV 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: 6662 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:19:13
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: 6663 **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.
No matter which alternative is chosen it is important that the following be observed carefully.
* Put Natural 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. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities.
I look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 6664 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:19:13
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: 6665 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:19:14
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: 6666 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:19:14
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: 6667 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:19:18
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: 6668 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:19:18
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: 6669 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:19:19
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.
I would think that the recent oil disaster in the gulf would cause us all to re-think our priorities. We need all healthy ecosystems for wildlife. NO to any ORV use at this time. The minions of wildlife that survives and is displaced, will need all healthy areas. Re-visit this jissue at a time when we know more about the outcome of this ecological disaster! This continent is all connected, not just parceled into little bits and pieces. Do not make a foolish decision now.

Correspondence ID: 6670 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:19:19
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. ORV use should be on toxic waste dumps.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 6671 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:19:19
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: 6672 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 09:19:19

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: 6673 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 09:19:19

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: 6674 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 09:19:19

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.

It's time we realized that birds and animals have just as much right to their lives as we do!

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

Correspondence ID: 6675 **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 quiet enjoyment is a priority for most of us, and that ORVs both destroy our peace and damage the habitat and the wildlife it supports. I am trying to be respectful, but the noise and the rip it up attitude of most ORVs is hard to take.

Here's what I think is important.

*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, I am unlikely to have peace in my walks and neither is wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, most of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: 6676 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May.07.2010 09:19:24

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: 6677 **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:

*National Parks were established to protect wilderness forever as well as the species who require those habitats. They were not established as playgrounds for humans riding around on ORVs, disturbing wildlife and crushing habitat. These activities should take place in off road parks set aside for them, not on a national seashore set aside for rare turtles and birds. No matter how loud the ORV contingent is, they have no moral ground to stand

on trying to ride around on a national seashore. This disturbs not only wildlife, but anyone seeking the solitude and quiet that the Park Service is supposed to be preserving for them. It completely ruins the experience to have those noisy things and the people who ride them come up on you while you're walking a beach, any beach, much less a national seashore.

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: 6678 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May.07.2010 09:19:24

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: 6679 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May.07.2010 09:19:24

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.

Wildlife must have protection from motorized intruders. People visiting beaches also should have the opportunity to enjoy them without the noise and commotion of ORVs.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: 6680 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May.07.2010 09:19:24

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: 6681 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 09:19:25

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: 6682 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 09:19:25

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: 6683 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 09:19:25

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: 6684 **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 the majority of visitors.

*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach - penalizing the vast majority for the benefit of the few. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: 6685 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 09:19:30

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: 6686 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 09:19:30

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:	6687	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,07,2010 09:19:30						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	<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>Thank You for this opportunity to discuss ORVs. There are times and places. Vital wildlife habitat especially at nesting time need quiet, unhindered by the noise and presence of motorized vehicles. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.</p> <p>The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:</p> <p>*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.</p> <p>* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.</p> <p>* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.</p>						

Correspondence ID:	6688	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,07,2010 09:19:30						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	<p>I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.</p> <p>This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.</p> <p>The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:</p> <p>*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.</p> <p>* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.</p> <p>* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.</p>						

Correspondence ID:	6689	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,07,2010 09:19:30						
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: 6690 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 09:19:35

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: 6691 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 09:19:35

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: 6692 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 09:19:35

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: 6693 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 09:19:35

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: 6694 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 09:19:35

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: 6695 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 09:19:35

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: 6696 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 09:19:35

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: 6697 **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 Florida resident, I am directly involved in both volunteer and work efforts to protect and preserve sea turtles and shorebirds. As a regular visitor to the Hatteras National Seashore (we are planning a trip for September 2010) I strongly support limits on ORV use of the beaches. We have been able to balance these uses in the State of Florida, and you can do it too.

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

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: 6698 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 09:19:41

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: 6699 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 09:19:41

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: 6700 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 09:19:41

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: 6701 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 09:19:41

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: 6702 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 09:19:41

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: 6703 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 09:19:41

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: 6704 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 09:19:41

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: 6705 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 09:19:41

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: 6706 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 09:19:46

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.

The ongoing crisis in the Gulf of Mexico has highlighted just how fragile shore and ocean populations are. Biodiversity is essential for human survival. Protecting these species is in our own best interests.

Correspondence ID: 6707 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private
Received: May.07.2010 09:19:46
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: 6708 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May.07.2010 09:19:47
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: 6709 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May.07.2010 09:19:47
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: 6710 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:19:47
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: 6711 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:19:47
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.
If the Gulf disaster has proven anything, it is that conservation and the preservation of our species and our resources is precious beyond compare. This is the issue of our lifetime. You have a chance to do the right thing. Please do so.

Correspondence ID: 6712 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:19:47
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: 6713 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:19:47
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: 6714 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:19:47
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: 6715 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:19:52
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: 6716 **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 volunteer worked at a nature preserve in N.E. Ohio that was constantly making efforts to keep ORV's from impacting protected habitat that was set aside for spotted turtles. The noise pollution, the air pollution and the physical destruction caused by the vehicles and ORV users is bad" say I Nancy. ORV have a productive use - on farms, for specified hunting areas for set-up of duck decoys or perhaps to haul in camp gear and haul out elk you've legally hunted. Water/Land areas MUST be protected for Earth's wildlife - it is their home nursery. Wildlife's food and shelter areas are supposed to be protected by humankind. Wildlife is threatened and much is in danger of extinction - we Humans are not (except at our own hands).

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

- *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
- * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
- * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until 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 ORV users need to work out deals with towns where they can cruise along highways, or with megafarms where they can race along the borders of vast stretches of cropland, plus aren't there already beaches that CURRENTLY allow motor vehicles like DAYTONA where ORV users can waste fuel. "I am a birder, my Mom is a birder, my Dad was a birder, my friends are birders. We vacation in places that we can go bird watching! Take a poll along the area of concern and many of the people you will talk to bird watch". I avoid ORV areas as the atmosphere they create is disharmonious, and polluted. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts 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 that Cape Hatteras remains a place to recreate and rejuvenate and enjoys God's granted grace. Thanks again for your time.

Correspondence ID: 6717 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May.07.2010 09:19:52

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: 6718 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May.07.2010 09:19:52

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,

0010761

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: 6719 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:19:52
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: 6720 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:19:52
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: 6721 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:19:52
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.
Please--once a species is gone, it is gone. Now that the disaster is unfolding in the gulf it is even more critical that we protect vital habitat for endangered/threatened/stressed birds, turtles and other wildlife. Isn't there enough destruction in the world already? Please keep our protected areas protected!

Correspondence ID: 6722 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:19:54
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Mike Murray, I disagree with the entire DEIS. I support the Coalition for Beach Access' position. This whole process has been Bogus from the start. I attended most of the reg-neg meetings and to claim this DEIS came from the input gathered at reg-neg is an insult! I won't bother getting into any details

because better qualified experts already gave you advise and you just ignored it! I'm sure, in your mind, you have better things to do than read another "redundant" reply. I'm sure you would rather be doing something useful like exterminating the wildlife in the park or chasing US citizens out of their National Seashore RECREATION Area; or whatever else the alleged "enviromentals" tell you to do.
Just for the record I did not agree the consent decree either.
Nevin Thomas

Correspondence ID: 6723 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:19:58
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: 6724 **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 support the protection of birds and sea turtles as well as all wildlife. We have an obligation to protect these precious, vulnerable creatures and their environment, especially since we humans have vastly contributed to the pollution of the Earth. Nature is such an amazing gift for us to witness and enjoy, so the least we can do is provide appreciation and respect by preserving its existence. Don't emulate fast food restaurants or Walmart that encourage over consumption and mass production offering products for less even though it really just costs us more in the end. There must be balance in life or else something will have to give and it usually is detrimental. Please ban the use of ORVs in order to encourage and promote the sustainability of such pristine wildlife and in the end, ours as well. Nature is the only true connection to peace and balance that we have, and God knows we need peace in our lives. If you overdue the accessibility to this environment, you are placing the wildlife in great danger, risking their survival, and thus ultimately destroying the very reason most come to visit, besides being completely irresponsible to Earth's Natural Law that existed way before humans came to be. Why did you create this land to be recognized as a National Seashore and Park in the first place? Build an off road course some place else without stealing the home of other wildlife. That's why race tracks are built, to protect innocent bystanders.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 6725 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:19:58
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: 6726 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:19:58
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: 6727 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:19:58
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: 6728 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:19:58
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: 6729 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 09:19:58

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: 6730 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 09:20:03

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: 6731 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 09:20:03

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: 6732 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 09:20:03

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.

We love Cape Hatteras and would hate to see it and its beautiful wildlife destroyed by ORV.

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

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: 6733 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 09:20:03

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: 6734 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 09:20:03

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.

ORV's are of interest only to a small group, almost entirely young males. The alternative plan would be for everyone.

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

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

*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: 6735 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 09:20:04

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: 6736 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 09:20:04

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: 6737 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 09:20:10

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.

As a visitor to this fragile and remarkable coastal area, I hope that your decisionmaking will preserve this seashore for future generations. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 6738 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 09:20:10

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: 6739 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 09:20:10

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: 6740 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 09:20:10

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: 6741 **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. I completed an extensive research project on the harmful impacts of ORV use on native ecosystems my senior year at Cornell University, and concluded from my studies that we must minimize such activities in order to protect a healthy ecosystem.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore is all-important, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 6742 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:20:10
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.
I feel ORVs have no place in National Parks. They are an assault on nature. Please consider a complete ban of their use. If not, then adopting an alternative plan would be better than nothing.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 6743 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:20:10
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: 6744 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 09:20:16

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: 6745 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 09:20:16

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: 6746 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 09:20:16

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: 6747 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 09:20:16

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: 6748 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 09:20:16

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: 6749 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 09:20:16

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: 6750 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 09:20:17

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: 6751 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 09:20:17

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: 6752 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 09:20:17

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: 6753 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 09:20:21

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: 6754 **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.

It appears "D" 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 need the the following principles followed if you decide not choose to enact Alternative D:

*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife without having to face the noise and fright caused when they approach. All visitors include those who use the beach for walks and picnics. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: 6755 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 09:20:22

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: 6756 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:20:22
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 birds and wildlife have a limited habitat. The people on off-road vehicles disrupt that habitat and they can certainly find less damaging places to ride.
I am a birdwatcher and hiker who values our special national places. Please consider protecting the seashore with the best practices. When disasters like the BP oil spill in the Gulf can happen, we need desperately to protect our seashores.
Thank you for allowing these comments.

Correspondence ID: 6757 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:20:22
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: 6758 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:20:22
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: 6759 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:20:27
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: 6760 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:20:27
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: 6761 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:20:27
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: 6762 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:20:27
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: 6763 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:20:27
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: 6764 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:20:32
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: 6765 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:20:32
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: 6766 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:20:32
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: 6767 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:20:32
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.
Really, this is a no-brainer! This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

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

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

Correspondence ID: 6768 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:20:32
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: 6769 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:20:32
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: 6770 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:20:33
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: 6771 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:20:33
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: 6772 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:20:33
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: 6773 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:20:38
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: 6774 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:20:38
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: 6775 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:38:14
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I was planning on going to Hatteras in June. It looks beautiful, but really only want to kite with my wife. We have traveled to many destinations for kiting. The short of it is this; Kiting isn't a cheap sport. Thusly, kites have a little extra coin. They make great tourists. Last, it is a clean, quiet sport.

Correspondence ID: 6776 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:40:27
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: 6777 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:40:27
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: 6778 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:40:27
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: 6779 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:40:27
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: 6780 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: There is absolutely no reason an off-road vehicle should be driven on the beaches of the Outer Banks except in the most rare of emergency circumstances. Please consider the outer banks as the rare gem they are, not a reckless playground for thrill sports enthusiasts.
I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until 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: 6781 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May.07.2010 09:40:27
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: 6782 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May.07.2010 09:40:27
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: 6783 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May.07.2010 09:40:32
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: 6784 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May.07.2010 09:40:32
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: 6785 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May.07,2010 09:40:32

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: 6786 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May.07,2010 09:40:37

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: 6787 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May.07,2010 09:40:37

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: 6788 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:40:37
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: 6789 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:40:37
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: 6790 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:40:37
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: 6791 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:40:42
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: 6792 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:40:43
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: 6793 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:40:48
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: 6794 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:40:48
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: 6795 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:40:48
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: 6796 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:40:48
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: 6797 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:40:53
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: 6798 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:40:53
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: 6799 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:40:54
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: 6800 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:40:59
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: 6801 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:40:59
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: 6802 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:40:59
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: 6803 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:40:59
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: 6804 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:41:00
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: 6805 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:41:05
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: 6806 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear National Park Service, We need to achieve a balance in our activities in nature. I support this comment because vehicles are a threat to wildlife and turtles are an important link in the food chain that also includes us. WE NEED BALANCE ON THESE MATTERS! Please help us to achieve this. June I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Correspondence ID: 6807 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:41:06
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: 6808 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:41:06
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: 6809 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:41:06
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: 6810 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:41:06
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to speak out on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Correspondence ID: 6811 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:41:11
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: 6812 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:41:11
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: 6813 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:41:12
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: 6814 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:41:12
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: 6815 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:41:12

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: 6816 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:41:12

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: 6817 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:41:17

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: 6818 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:41:17
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: 6819 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:41:17
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: 6820 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:41:17
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: 6821 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:41:17
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.
 Not only is Cape Hatteras in need of more restrictions for ORV use, but ALL eastern shoreline areas should be protected, especially where endangered species nest.

Correspondence ID: 6822 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:41:23
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
 The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
 Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
 Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
 Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Correspondence ID: 6823 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:41:23
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
 The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
 Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
 Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
 Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Correspondence ID: 6824 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:41:23
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
 The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
 Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
 Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent

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

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

Correspondence ID: 6825 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:41:23
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Correspondence ID: 6826 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:41:24
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: 6827 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:41:24
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: 6828 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:41:24
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: 6829 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:41:24
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: 6830 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:41:30
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Correspondence ID: 6831 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:41:30
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: 6832 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May.07.2010 09:41:30
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Correspondence ID: 6833 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May.07.2010 09:41:30
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Correspondence ID: 6834 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May.07.2010 09:41:30
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

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

Correspondence ID: 6835 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:41:36
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: 6836 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Our barrier islands provide crucial habitat to sea turtles, wildlife, and a broad diversity of birds. It is our responsibility to guard and protect this area. Human interference, by allowing more Off Road Vehicles and man-made structures only serve to upset this ecosystem.
In light of the recent Gulf oil spill, and with possibility of future oil/gas drilling off the Atlantic coast line, our barrier islands and it's wildlife are threatened even further.
Please work to keep the wild areas wild. Visitors to the Outer Banks that truly love the area want it to be preserved, not turned into just a tourist area with buildings, walkways, roads, cars, off-road vehicles, and other noisy activities.
Access facilities and equal access planning should be consistent with overall planning to PROTECT our important barrier islands and Atlantic coastline. I suggest that access facilities and walkway building need not be expanded, just improve those that already exist. This may end up costing less from National Parks budget as well.
The above comments are my own.
C. Andrews, Charlottesville, VA
[The comments below are as stated by the Defenders of Wildlife website:
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.]

Correspondence ID: 6837 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:41:36
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: 6838 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:41:36
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: 6839 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:41:42
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: 6840 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:41:42
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I really don't understand the point of driving vehicles on the beach? We know where the car's place is, on the road. Please do something about this and help save numerous animals such as sea turtles and other endangered animals. Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 6841 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:41:42
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: 6842 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:41:42

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: 6843 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y**Name:** private**Received:** May,07,2010 09:41:42**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: 6844 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y**Name:** private**Received:** May,07,2010 09:41:42**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: 6845 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y**Name:** private**Received:** May,07,2010 09:41:47**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: 6846 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:41:47
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: 6847 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:41:47
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: 6848 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:41:52
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: As a native 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.

Correspondence ID: 6849 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:41:53
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: 6850 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:41:53
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: 6851 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:41:53
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: 6852 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:41:58
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: 6853 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 09:43:19

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: 6854 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 09:43:19

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: 6855 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 09:43:19

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: 6856 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 09:43:19

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: 6857 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 09:43:19

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: 6858 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 09:43:39

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: 6859 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:43:39

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: 6860 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:43:39

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: 6861 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:43:39

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: 6862 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:43:39

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: 6863 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:43:51

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: 6864 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:43:51

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: 6865 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:43:51

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: 6866 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:43:51

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: 6867 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:43:51

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: 6868 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 09:44:02

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.

Please implement 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.

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: 6869 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 09:44:02

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: 6870 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 09:44:02

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: 6871 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:44:02

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: 6872 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:44:02

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: 6873 **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.

We must provide sanctuaries for wildlife where ORV's are not allowed; this planet has always been large enough for all to live in peace and it is only man's greed and selfishness that has destroyed so much. ORV's have their place but they should not be allowed everywhere; we must care for the other

creatures and their God-given right to have a safe place to live their lives.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: 6874 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 09:44:16

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.

Mr. Murry I have deleted the form message as I'm sure you've memorized it by now.

I have only in the last 7 years started to visit your beautiful seashores. They are a haven of serenity for me. I would really like to see your beaches free of unnecessary vehicles all together. I understand the Park Service should utilize ORV's, in fact it's always a pleasure when they come by. I also understand that the local population has become accustomed to using their beaches as they see fit, but sometimes with familiarity comes complacency. We need to become a society that isn't so self centered, We need to look at the whole picture and do the right thing for everyone and the environment.

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

Correspondence ID: 6875 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 09:44:16

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: 6876 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 09:44:17

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: 6877 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:44:17
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: 6878 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:44:17
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.
Nature deserves our respect.

Correspondence ID: 6879 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:44:21
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: 6880 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 09:44:21
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: 6881 **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: PLEASE PLEASE PLEASE Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Correspondence ID: 6882 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 10:10:30
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent

degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Correspondence ID: 6883 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May.07,2010 10:10:30
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Correspondence ID: 6884 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May.07,2010 10:10:35
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: 6885 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May.07,2010 10:10:36
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: 6886 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May.07,2010 10:10:36
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: 6887 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 10:10:41
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: 6888 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 10:10:41
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: 6889 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 10:10:41
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: 6890 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 10:10:46
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: 6891 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 10:10:47
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: 6892 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 10:10:47
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: 6893 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 10:10:47
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: 6894 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 10:10:47
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: 6895 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 10:10:47
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: 6896 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 10:10:52
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: 6897 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 10:10:52
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: 6898 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 10:10:53
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: 6899 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 10:10:53
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: 6900 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 10:10:53
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: 6901 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 10:10:58
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: 6902 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 10:10:58
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: 6903 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 10:10:58
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: 6904 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 10:10:58
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: 6905 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 10:10:58
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: 6906 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 10:10:59
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: 6907 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 10:10:59
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: 6908 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 10:11:04
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: 6909 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: With the oil gushing in the Gulf protecting clean habitat is more important than ever. Personally I think none of the beach should be used for ORV's ! But that being obviously impossible if the beach is saved from the oil lets save the beach! Please!
I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

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

Correspondence ID: 6910 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 10:11:04
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: 6911 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 10:11:04
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: 6912 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 10:11:09
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: 6913 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 10:11:10

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: 6914 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y**Name:** private**Received:** May,07,2010 10:11:10**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: 6915 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y**Name:** private**Received:** May,07,2010 10:11:10**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: 6916 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y**Name:** private**Received:** May,07,2010 10:11:15**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: 6917 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 10:11:15
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. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Correspondence ID: 6918 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 10:11:15
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: 6919 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 10:11:15
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: 6920 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 10:11:15
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: 6921 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 10:11:20
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: 6922 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 10:11:20
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: 6923 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 10:11:20
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: 6924 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 10:11:21

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence:

As a frequent visitor of the Outer Banks, I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: 6925 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 10:11:21

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: 6926 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 10:11:26

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: 6927 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 10:11:26
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: 6928 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 10:11:26
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: 6929 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 10:11:26
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.
Is there nowhere we don't need to drive?

Correspondence ID: 6930 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 10:11:29
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: 6931 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 10:11:32
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: 6932 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 10:11:32
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: 6933 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 10:11:32
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: 6934 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 10:11:32
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: 6935 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 10:11:32
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.
 Our family visits the Outer Banks and Hatteras regularly, so even though I live in Maryland, I have a great interest in the fragile Carolina coasts.

Correspondence ID: 6936 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 10:11:32
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: 6937 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 10:13:24
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: 6938 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 10:13:24
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: 6939 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 10:13:24
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: 6940 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 10:13:24
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: 6941 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 10:13:40
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: 6942 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 10:13:40
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: 6943 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 10:13:40
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: 6944 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 10:13:40
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.
Sincerely,
Jennis Warren Charlottesville, Virginia

Correspondence ID: 6945 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 10:13:51
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. Please remember that ORVs do not fit in with the balance of nature. It may be great for humans to have fun with fuel driven vehicles but good judgement is needed as to where these ORVs can be used.

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

Correspondence ID: 6946 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 10:13:57

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: 6947 **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.

Off-road vehicle access is a privilege and not a right. Where it can be done responsibly without harming sensitive wildlife and negatively affecting the enjoyment of the park by other people, it is fine. But where there is a conflict between off-road vehicle use and protecting sensitive wildlife (particularly birds, whose populations are already in steep decline throughout the country), the decision should always go to the activities that have the least negative impacts on the environment.

It should be emphasized that off-road vehicle usage does not just negatively affect wildlife, but it negatively affects many (human) visitors and their ability to enjoy the beaches in a variety of ways as well (noise, pollution, safety, etc). Many people come to Cape Hatteras from across the country for the ability to enjoy the stunning natural beauty of the area, and to so observe rare birds and other wildlife. With off-road vehicles roaring through the areas and regularly scaring off wildlife, there will be much less incentive for people to come and enjoy the area for its natural beauty.

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

Correspondence ID: 6948 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 10:13:58

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: 6949 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 10:13:58
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: 6950 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 10:13:58
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: 6951 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 10:14:04
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: 6952 **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 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. As divers and birders, this issue is very important to us.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management 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: 6953 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 10:14:05
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: 6954 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 10:14:05
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: 6955 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 10:14:05
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: 6956 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 10:14:05
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: 6957 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 10:14:11
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: 6958 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 10:14:11
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.
 I totally agree. We're up against the problem of human encroachment on natural habitats; we need more protected wild life areas. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
 The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
 *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
 * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
 * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 6959 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 10:14:11
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: 6960 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 10:14:11
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: 6961 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 10:14:11
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: 6962 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 10:14:11
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: 6963 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 10:14:11
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:	6964	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,07,2010 10:20:06						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>						
Correspondence ID:	6965	Project:	10641	Document:	32596		
Name:	Gless, Wayne						
Received:	Apr,25,2010 00:00:00						
Correspondence Type:	Letter						
Correspondence:	<p>I would like to comment to the NPS (DEIS) which I feel is flawed. Some point in particular that I strongly disagree with.</p> <p>I disagree with the routes and areas. Why has NPS never made public a list of reported incidents?</p> <p>On page 210 no piping plover deaths have been attributed to general ORV's. Most of all cases have involved NPS ORV's.</p> <p>I disagree with closures due to birds; I disagree with the killing or capture of other native animals to save birds.</p> <p>Why close massive areas when only 3% of interference is attributed to humans whether in an ORV or pedestrian.</p> <p>Cultural/historical values, I disagree with the DEIS when they only have 2 paragraphs out of the 800 page document devoted to this.</p> <p>I disagree with the socioeconomic analysis. The visitor count should have been with the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area, only; not Fort Raleigh and the Wright Brothers National Memorial.</p> <p>There is incomplete data since they did not use data from the first full year of the consent decree (2009).</p> <p>I strongly disagree with the restrictions on pets on page 136; I can't understand why the pets on 6 foot leashes would pose a problem, (none that I have ever heard of).</p> <p>Why was alternative F attributed to the advisory committee? Whom the negative regulation was discontinued.</p>						
Correspondence ID:	6966	Project:	10641	Document:	32596		
Name:	Powell, Robin						
Received:	Apr,25,2010 00:00:00						
Correspondence Type:	Letter						
Correspondence:	<p>Attn: Mike Murray Cape Hatteras National Seashore</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - I disagree with visitor experience (pv1) I have never heard of a pedestrian being hit by 1 vehicle. Pedestrian only areas are easily restricted by signs. - I disagree with the protected species still at risk, (p. 210) I have seen the plover (though rarely) and never heard of anyone being hurt by an ORV. Why does the NPS close south facing beaches longer (pg. xix) than in Avon, Rodanthe & Saluo. - I agree with page 1 about ORV's being a primary source of access and they should remain so. I am disabled. I can only get around with the aid of a walker. Cape Point and the inlets have always been one of my favorite places to drive to. - I strongly disagree with closures due to birds (pg. 468). Close off the nesting areas far above the tide line. The natural predation of other species that always been a part of wildlife are far more to blame. - I agree with the protection of the turtles. But let the ORV's have access around the nests until the incubation period and then protect their journey to the sea (pg. 125 and 377). <p>Robin Powell P.O. Box 636 Buxton, North Carolina 27920</p>						
Correspondence ID:	6967	Project:	10641	Document:	32596		
Name:	Camp, Patricia						
Received:	Apr,25,2010 00:00:00						
Correspondence Type:	Letter						
Correspondence:	<p>50242 Timber Trail Frisco, NC 27936 April 25, 2010 Mike Murray, Superintendent Cape Hatteras National Seashore 1401 National Park Drive Manteo, NC 27954</p> <p>Dear Mr. Murray, In the DEIS NPS Preferred Alternative F on Page 136, it prohibits pets to be on the beach during bird breeding season even in areas in front of the villages. This does not make sense. If it has not been found necessary to block off an area for breeding, then dogs would not be any more detrimental than people to the beach. If there is a problem with people allowing their dogs to run free, enforce the rules. The amount of beach that people can use has been reduced to the point where enforcement does not need to be extensive.</p> <p>Sincerely, Patricia Camp</p>						
Correspondence ID:	6968	Project:	10641	Document:	32596		
Name:	Camp, Patricia						
Received:	Apr,25,2010 00:00:00						
Correspondence Type:	Letter						
Correspondence:	<p>50242 Timber Trail Frisco, NC 27936 April 25, 2010 Mike Murray, Superintendent Cape Hatteras National Seashore 1401 National Park Drive Manteo, NC 27954</p> <p>Dear Mr. Murray,</p> <p>The DEIS NPS Preferred Alternative F on Pages 121 - 127 & Page 468, states the need for large and inflexible breeding and nesting buffers. Every year, a pair of Oyster Catchers breeds and nests where Hurricane Isabel broke through Hatteras Island. Due to the lack of land between the road and the sound, the buffer cannot conform to the current requirements. However, the birds seem to have adapted just fine to the limitations. This begs the question, why is it necessary to increase the current buffer? It does not make any sense!</p> <p>Sincerely, Patricia Camp</p>						
Correspondence ID:	6969	Project:	10641	Document:	32596		

Name: Giannatti, Nancy
Received: Apr,25,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Letter
Correspondence: Nancy Giannotti P.O. Box 357 Buxton, N.C. 27920 Mike Murray, Superintendent Cape Hatteras National Seashore 1401 National Park Drive Manteo, NC 27954
 I agree with you that Piping Plover needs to be protected, but I disagree with some of the ways that you are protecting them. You, yourself said that the Piping Plover will not nest in grass, so why not plow up the grass rather than move the stakes closer each year to the ocean.
 We all know that the outer banks always have hurricanes, over wash that entirely wash away nests and baby birds. In the past 1970's and early 80's the maintenance people always plowed up the grass (especially around the pond and the point) so the birds could nest and use the pond for water, therefore, freeing them from over wash and hurricanes.
 This allows the people to use the ocean and birds be safe at the pond.
 Sincerely, Nancy Giannotti

Correspondence ID: 6970 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Griffin, Merrill and Larry T
Received: Apr,24,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Letter
Correspondence: Mike Murray, Superintendent Cape Hatteras National Seashore 1401 National Park Drive Manteo, NC 27954
 Merrill T. Griffin Larry T. Griffin PO Box 552 Avon, NC 27915
 Dear Mike,
 My husband and I agree with the DEIS statement "protect and preserve natural and cultural resources on page 1. Cape Point is a great cultural experience for young people and adults alike. The shoals and graveyard of the Atlantic are of great historical significance. This area should be accessible by ORVS to preserve the culture of this area.
 Sincerely,
 Merrill T. Griffin
 4/24/2010

Correspondence ID: 6971 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Griffin, Merrill and Larry T
Received: Apr,24,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Letter
Correspondence: Mike Murray, Superintendent Cape Hatteras National Seashore 1401 National Park Drive Manteo, NC 27954
 Merrill T. Griffin Larry T Griffin PO Box 552 Avon, NC 27915
 Dear Mike, My husband and I agree with the DEIS statement "ORV'S have long served as a primary form of access for many portions of the beach in the seashore and continue to be the most practical means of access and parking for many visitors" (page 1). Pedestrian access only harms grandparents with young grandchildren as is nearly impossible to carry all the items needed for a great beach experience for them across a long stretch of soft hot sand. We abide by all the wildlife enclosures and clean the beach when needed. Please continue to allow ORV's for beach access.
 Sincerely,
 Merrill T. Griffin 4/24/2010

Correspondence ID: 6972 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: DiTondo, Mike
Received: Apr,22,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Letter
Correspondence: Mike Murray, Superintendent Cape Hatteras National Seashore 1401 National Park Drive Manteo, NC 27954
 4-22-2010
 - New ramps 32.5 to ramp 38 do NOT AGREE NO CLOSURES NEEDED. - Cape Point DO NOT AGREE to March 15th to September 15th closure. ANY BIRDS NESTING WOULD MOVE TO BETTER PROTECTED AREAS. - 0.2 mile South Ramp 4 to Oregon Inlet Pond. DO NOT AGREE ON CLOSING March 15th to July 31st. Nesting birds will find and nest in inland waters where better protected. - I DO NOT AGREE with consent agreed upon. Need to reverse this and get back to common sense. - I purchased a house in 1986 and then RETIRED HERE in 1999. Main reason is I like to fish and use open beaches and do not think NPS or JUDGE BOYLE has any business to change to what we have now!!
 Regards,
 Mike DiTondo 107 Vee Lee Drive K.D.H, NC 27948 252-441-19271

Correspondence ID: 6973 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Sheffield, Jim
Received: Apr,25,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Letter
Correspondence: Mike Murray 1401 National Park Drive Manteo, NC 27954
 RE: Seashore Access Plan
 Dear Mr. Murray,
 I am sure you have not received many if any letters agreeing with the Park service plan to again close sections of the beach to ORV traffic. The plan is impressive in length and content. Pages 222 ? 257 clearly identify problem areas of use conflict between nature and man.
 This also is in opposition to the beach access closure proposed.
 Now just turned 60, I look back to my access to the beaches from Nags Head to Ocracoke over the many years. My youth, early marriage, two children growing up, have produced many memories of our ORV experiences. I can remember going onto the beach at the old Coast Guard station at the Oregon Inlet Bridge and driving on the beach all the way to Buxton lighthouse.
 I have met many friends on the beach, some fishing early spring and others early winter, some in the heat of the summer. The one thing I have found in my many years of cumulative time spent on the beach is there is no one time of the year to enjoy the beach. The beach is used blue skies and hurricanes' alike, heat of the summer and coldest winter day or night.
 The economy of OBX is sole dependent on beach access. Without the beach and access thereto many residents will be without work. The current economy as it is has created harm to OBX's economy, but there is clear evidence that the prior year beach closures have also added to this situation. I believe in protecting nature. I admit I am not the one to make the decision what measure to use in protecting birds and turtles or humanity.
 I respectfully ask is there not a reasonable way to give access to the entire beach if limited to only direct ramp to water edge back 100 to 150 from the ocean. The Outer Banks Seashore provides experience through the entire year. Your proposals eliminate prime fishing experiences for the entire family during peak seasonal fish migrations, both spring and fall.
 I see your office is in Manteo. Currently my wife and I reside (second home) in Manteo Marina across from the replica ship on Festival Island. Our boat name is Sea Venture. You will see our 2 labs on the back deck. Please feel free to come by. We would both enjoy meeting you.
 Jim Sheffield Cell: 804-938-6560

Correspondence ID: 6974 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 10:34:44
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: To whom it may concern: Public beach access for the Cape Hatteras National Seashore is not only a right of US Citizens, but must be preserved in order to continue the way of life for those who live on Hatteras Island. The impact on the tourist industry and the fishing industry will be severe to say the least. Please take into consideration the generations who have enjoyed this unique, pristine stretch of beach and the generations to come who will be unable to enjoy it. Every effort is made by the vast majority of visitors and locals on this island to preserve the natural habitat that exists there. We realize that in order for this island to stay as it is, we must co-exist with the species that thrive there. That being said, to remove human interaction from the equation will not make a significant impact on the survival of species who existence is not threatened currently. Please consider the will of the majority who love this island for what it is, and not the will of the minority who seek only to eliminate human interaction wherever it exists. If we allow this to occur on this small stretch of sand, they will only require in the future that we allow the Atlantic ocean to take back our sandbar completely... something the NPS has proven time and time again that it is in support of by not repairing fallen dune-lines that protect not only many millions of dollars in investments, but the other species who thrive there as a result. Thank you for your consideration of our rights as Americans to free and open beach access for all. Remember, were it not for the tourist and fishing market on the island, the islanders will surely face absolute poverty.

Correspondence ID: 6975 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Bough, Joe
Received: Apr,25,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Letter
Correspondence: Please keep our beaches open and free there is room for fisherman and birds and turtles.

Correspondence ID: 6976 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Sharp, Bob and Becky
Received: Apr,25,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Letter
Correspondence: This letter comes to you hoping that you are intelligent and open minded re the Outer Banks ORV Rules.
The Outer Banks pioneer families donated this marvelous seashore area to the Federal Government for a National Recreation Area, as a perpetual hope that all people would be able to enjoy the fishing, swimming, shelling and boating advantages. On top of that list was their own families and descendents.
If the proposals of the special interest groups that are determined to close this National Seashore Recreational area for populating birds or whatever narrow minded reasons they can fabricate become policy, those who have called the OBX their home for generations will be literally pushed out of their homeland by strangers. They will be unable to make a living if the tourist industry suffers, and suffer it will. Most tourists are fishermen, or beach lovers. If they are unable to do either activity except in a tiny designated area or by an entrance ticket, they will seek other shores. I can assure you we will if this is proclaimed.
The other methods the descendents use to provide for their families are fishing, trapping crabs, etc. or taking fishing charters. Much of this provides fresh fish for area restaurants. It is not economically feasible in these days of high gas prices to even consider transporting their catch to the remote populated cities. Once again, these people will suffer as they join the ranks of unemployed Americans who would like to work and have a political policy doing more harm than good.
Life is not all black and white. Sometimes one must consider the greater good. Given the choice of letting people live, work and have their lives uninterrupted in their homeland or chasing birds hoping you can corral them into a designated area doesn't sound like much of a hard choice.
There are many unemployed Americans in cities that are unable to find work. You live on the Outer Banks; you know hardship will befall these people. They cannot just pick up and leave their homes, their traditions, their families.... they don't want to and they lack the funds to start over from scratch. In decades past, their ancestors had to be hard working and have great survival skills just to remain there. Do not let their efforts to have land for their descendents to enjoy have been in vain. This is your responsibility.
Let us keep America the Home of the Free.
Thank You,
Most Sincerely,
Bob & Becky Sharp 893 N. Homestead Lane Lancaster, KY 40444

Correspondence ID: 6977 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Granger, Dave J
Received: May,07,2010 10:37:55
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: 6978 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Wright Jr., Robert L
Received: Apr,20,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Letter
Correspondence: April 20, 2010
Dear Supt. Murray,
I have been diving and surf fishing at the outer banks for over 40 years; it is one of the most enjoyable things I have ever done. The banks are not only beautiful, but they are the best surf fishing place anywhere.
I hope a resolution can be found so that I may continue to pursue this, along with many others.
Thank You, Mr. Robert L. Wright Jr. 1003 Kendale Circle Chesapeake, VA 23322-6872

Correspondence ID: 6979 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: Smithson, Dale
Received: Apr.25.2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Letter
Correspondence: 4-25-2010

I do not agree with the DEIS ORV Version F. Statistics show that when humans are present in certain areas predation in those areas is slowed and decreased greatly. Placing 1000 foot buffers makes threatened animals more prone to predation. Several military bases, which are government ran, only have 30 feet buffers around endangered animals. Closing the beaches would be an economical disaster on residents of Hatteras Island. Don't people have the same rights as animals? Seems like some compromise could be made for all.
Dale Smithson Resident

Correspondence ID: 6980 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private
Received: May.07.2010 10:40:49
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: 6981 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private
Received: May.07.2010 10:40:50
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: 6982 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private
Received: May.07.2010 10:40:50
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: 6983 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 10:40:51
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: 6984 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 10:40:51
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: 6985 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 10:40:54
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.
Please do all you can to protect wildlife and their habitats.

Correspondence ID: 6986 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 10:41:14
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am a bird lover, own and organic market and fought to stop aerial pesticide spraying in favor of integrated pesticide management and cared for over a doz blue bird boxes at my previous home near Assateague NP in MD. I now live in Buxton NC right at the hot seat of this debate and sign up to 3 petitions a day for animal , environment and sustainable agriculture, organic standards etc. I have a good idea now when birds & turtles nest at our

beaches and have seen them first hand coming in to lay their eggs . Yes I can see closure times for off road vehicles during this time only but closing them at other times or not allowing horse or pedestrians access to the beaches is wrong,it is our park like any other park. You have to remember there are huge tracks of Pea Island here and Okracoke island beaches that are not accessible with tremendous areas for bird nesting. I also do not want to see the construction of any walkways. The only thing the locals have here is the beach and it is being threatened not by the off roads vehicles but by the proposed oil drilling and the huge spill in the gulf. This is by far a much more serious threat and the locals here do not seem motivated to fight the drilling. This group wants drilling and to ride on the beach year round. I believe it should be closed during nesting season and only during nesting season,the # of vehicles if shown to be increasing should be limited to approx. what the levels are now .If there were not so many other nesting areas I would feel differently. It seems the park service want to close the best fishing areas like the point,shoals area and the inlet . The fact is the huge fishing vessels are the real threat to the fisheries not these fisherman. I do not know why the park is after the best fishing spots but its wrong. I cant agree on this action ,it is way too extreme,I live here and I know this for a fact there is NO REASON to close the beach after breeding season all the birds and turtles leave ,I walk the beaches when they are almost desolate all year so I think I know the facts. Please focus on the oil drilling and getting this nation off petrochemicals. If we had bio diesel running our ferries,boats and being sold to all these 4 wheel truck life would be much better for the wildlife here,this is our real problem,this filthy diesel here.Secondly the Dawn commercials making themselves look like heros cleaning oiled otters etc. is itself a petrochemical that is easily replaced by vegetable based detergents such as 7th generation ,sun & earth ,Dr. Bronners etc. These commercials are the biggest hypocrisy I have ever seen. These large corporations are ruining our environment from their petrochemicals to their perfumes and chemicals. These are such worse problems to our wildlife than the fisherman here that catch whatever the limit imposed is. These proposals are suspect because they are beyond rational or fair,limiting #s of vehicles and seasonal closures are reasonable . I also do not believe people should be required to pay a fee for a fishing permit ,I love to grow my garden and fish conservatively and it should be free as the creator meant it to be ,Chris J.Wade

Correspondence ID: 6987 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 10:41:14
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: 6988 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 10:41:16
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: 6989 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 10:41:16
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: 6990 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May.07.2010 10:41:16
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: 6991 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May.07.2010 10:41:21
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: 6992 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May.07.2010 10:41:21
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: 6993 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 10:41:22
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: 6994 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 10:41:23
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Correspondence ID: 6995 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 10:41:27
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: 6996 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 10:41:27
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: 6997 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 10:41:27
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: 6998 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 10:41:28
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: 6999 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 10:41:33
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.

Thank you.

Correspondence ID:	7000	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,07,2010 10:41:33						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	<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: 7001 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 10:41:33
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: 7002 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 10:41:34
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: 7003 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 10:41:34
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: 7004 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 10:41:41
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: 7005 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May.07.2010 10:41:41
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: 7006 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May.07.2010 10:41:41
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: 7007 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May.07.2010 10:41:47
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: 7008 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 10:41:47
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: 7009 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 10:41:47
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: 7010 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 10:41:48
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: 7011 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 10:41:53

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: 7012 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y**Name:** private**Received:** May,07,2010 10:41:53**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: 7013 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y**Name:** private**Received:** May,07,2010 10:41:53**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: 7014 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y**Name:** private**Received:** May,07,2010 10:41:53**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: 7015 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 10:41:59
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. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Correspondence ID: 7016 **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 to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Correspondence ID: 7017 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 10:41:59
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: 7018 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 10:41:59
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: 7019 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 10:41:59
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: 7020 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 10:41:59
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: 7021 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 10:41:59
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: 7022 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Markham, Elaine W
Received: Apr,22,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Letter
Correspondence: April 22, 2010 Dear Mike,
Please try to be as reasonable as possible when dealing with us ? property owners in Kmashat Shores.
We all love the beach and we want to help you in the Park Service.
Some folks go off the deep end when they don't get their way. Just help us all you can to save our beach.
I am 87 years old and can't walk down to the beach anymore. So when my kid's come to take me in their four wheel drive cars do to the beach. I rally look forward to that trip.
Everyone has a story
Sincerely Elaine W. Markham

Correspondence ID: 7023 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 10:42:07
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: 7024 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 10:42:12
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: 7025 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Schwester, E J

Received: Apr,21,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Letter
Correspondence: 4/21/2010
 Mike Murray, Supt. Cape Hatteras National Seashore 1401 National Park Dr. Manteo, N.C. 27954
 Dear Sir:
 Reference: Pgs 121-127 Closures Due to Birds
 Since a tide change is 6 hours from high to low tide, then the exposed sand for ORV use is approximately 3 hours for each tide, (normal conditions). This timed corridor can be established for conditional ORV use (dependent upon wind/water conditions) on most beaches. This is especially true from Cape Point South to and below Ramp 49, wherein this beach is very flat, (accessible from Ramp 45). While being a narrow corridor it serves the nationally famous east coast hot spot for access to Cape Point for all to continue to enjoy.
 Since Plovers do not nest in water or water washed shores it would be the perfect solution for this beach section.
 Thanks You
 E.J. Schwester P.O. Box 425 Frisco, N.C. 27936

Correspondence ID: 7026 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 10:43:29
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 extremely important to me.
 The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
 *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
 * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
 * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 7027 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 10:43:29
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: 7028 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 10:43:29
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: 7029 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 10:43:34
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: 7030 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 10:43:34
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: 7031 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 10:43:34
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: 7032 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 10:43:35
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: 7033 **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, no vehicles should be allowed on the beach. The beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife only. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 7034 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 10:43:35
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. There are plenty of other areas that these vehicles can go.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: 7035 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 10:43:36

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: 7036 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 10:43:44

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Written Public Comment on CHNSRA ORV DEIS Submitted by:

Alan Pitt Richmond, VA May 7, 2010

To Whom It May Concern:

Thank you for the opportunity to submit a written public comment on the CHNSRA ORV DEIS. I would also like to take this opportunity to thank Superintendent Mike Murray, Cyndy Holda, and all the CHNSRA staff involved in bringing this matter to a close.

Firstly, the 90-day time period to read, digest, and comment on an 800 page document that took over a year to produce seems quite understated for a document of this scope and magnitude. Also, this is not just a ruling on ORV use within the park, as it also sets guidelines on where pedestrians and pets can access the beaches, and also goes so far as to describe where differing types of recreation can occur. (See kite flying/kiteboarding)

The enabling legislation for CHNSRA declares the park to be a recreational area for humans to enjoy, and it is clear the intent of the area was such, and not that of a Wildlife refuge, which seems to be the desire of those who have brought lawsuits against the NPS pursuant to this discussion.

Said legislation also includes two very important and contradictory statements that are both being addressed within the DEIS, although inconclusively. Enabling Legislation:

"Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, particularly swimming, boating, sailing, fishing, and other recreational activities of similar nature, which shall be developed for such uses as needed, the said areas shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness and no development of the project or plan for the convenience of visitors shall be undertaken which would be incompatible with the preservation of the unique flora and fauna or the physiographic conditions now prevailing in this area.

"?when title to all the lands, except those within the limits of established villages, within boundaries to be designated by the Secretary of Interior within the area of approximately one hundred square miles on the islands of Chicamacomico [Hatteras], Ocracoke, Bodie, Roanoke, and Collington, and the waters and the lands beneath the waters adjacent there to shall have been vested in the United States, said areas shall be, and is hereby, established, dedicated, and set apart as a national seashore for the benefit and enjoyment of the people and shall be known as the Cape Hatteras National Seashore."

CHNSRA had seemingly struck a balance between these two divergent mandates from the park inception through the implementation of the Interim Plan in 2007, and the associated FONSI. That being the case, the only valid reason for this entire discussion is to determine how these two will work together, and not the total elimination of either.

Executive Orders 11644 and 11989, which mandated ORV management within all applicable NPS units, were in fact largely ignored by the CHNSRA NPS until the submission of the 1978 version, which mysteriously vanished before being added to the federal Register. This in no way should be held against the ORV user group, but rather against the CHNSRA staff of that era. Had they followed through on the issue at that time, we would not be engaging in this discussion today.

The fact that the Interim Plan received a FONSI is very telling, and indicative that the NPS had the right management plans in place all since the issuance of the pertinent EO's. Species management in CHNSRA has in fact grown apace with the scientific findings concerning ESA/NC listed species as the science surrounding them has evolved. To say that CHNSRA has catered more to the ORV user group than to sensitive species is an outright falsehood, and one that has been stated repeatedly by those who categorically oppose ORV use on any beach anywhere within the U.S.

Specifics:

Listed Bird Management:

Use of the Patuxent Protocols in the creation of the size of any and all bird closures within CHNSRA utilize the very largest and longest lasting closures found anywhere in the United States. The reasons behind using such in CHNSRA, and not in locations where species like PIPL are actually endangered is rather dubious at best. Most cited sources within the DEIS state 200-300m to be adequate buffer distances for all bird species of concern within the park. I disagree with the proposed management protocols set forth in both Alt's D & F, and instead support the protocols as set forth by the interim plan.

Listed Turtle Management:

Use of non-USFWS/USGS protocols in CHNSRA have not shown any appreciable increase in turtle productivity, while unnecessarily closing larger areas of beach to ORV's AND pedestrians for longer periods of time than those used in other areas of the U.S. The USFWS protocols in use at PINWR are not only more sensible, but show better results for the species though the utilization of more common sense management techniques like breathable light abatement closures, nest enclosures against predation, and the practice of moving nests from areas where they will likely be destroyed/repeatedly inundated. I disagree with the proposed management protocols set forth in both Alt's D & F, and instead support the protocols as set forth by the interim plan, or those used by the USFWS in PINWR.

Listed Plant Management:

If Seabeach Amaranth, (SBA), has indeed been extirpated from the park since 2005, the need for a discussion around "desired future conditions" concerning it seems moot. If the area is so inhospitable to said plant naturally, it seems a wasteful folly to attempt to reintroduce it to an ecosystem that it has not flourished within. I disagree with the proposed management protocols set forth in both Alt's D & F, and instead support the protocols as set forth by the interim plan.

ORV Management:

The only proven detrimental impacts by ORV's within the seashore are those directly related to protected species during breeding/nesting/fledging periods, and those are dubious at best. All other studies included in the DEIS show long-term negligible impacts to habitat, as the very dynamic nature of a barrier island system can and do erase all traces of ORV use, many times overnight. I can sympathize with the "viewshed" issues some user group[s] may have with ORV's on the beaches, but personally I find the thousands of signs erected on the ocean beaches, beside Rt. 12, and on the soundside shoreline to be far more of an eyesore than that of a vehicle profile. I disagree with the proposed management protocols set forth in both Alt's D & F, and instead support the protocols as set forth by the interim plan.

Pedestrian Management:

This is where the DEIS fall woefully short of actual protections, as year after year the NPS resource management reports show the single largest group in violation of resource closures are pedestrians. The DEIS requires fees, permits, and an education component for ORV users, but absolutely none for pedestrians. There are also no informational signs located at the meetings of ORV areas and pedestrians area, such as at Ramp 49's meeting with the Frisco villages at Robin Lane. Pedestrians from these housing units walk as far as Cape Point to the north and Hatteras village to the south. Nowhere on the beaches are the same signs that exist at every ramp, therefore leaving the pedestrian user group oblivious to the rules and regulations with then seashore. This is a travesty that must not be allowed to continue. All ingress/egress points where pedestrian dominant beaches meet ORV dominant beaches should be required to have the same signage as every ORV ramp, minus the ramp number. How else will the user group with the greatest number of closure violations ever be educated? I disagree with the proposed management protocols set forth in both Alt's D & F, and instead support the protocols as set forth by the interim plan.

Pet Management:

Our non-human family members are already at a disadvantage in CHNSRA, as they must either be crated or leashed at all times to simply be allowed in the seashore.

Out of the ten National Seashores nationwide, there are only two in Florida that ban pets outright, which is due solely to Florida state law.

The single most troubling aspect of the entire DEIS is the recommendations within the AMOY section in Chapter 2, Page 136, Table 13, Alt F that states "Prohibition of pets within the seashore during breeding season including in front of the villages, and establishment of breeding and non-breeding SMA's would benefit the AMOY". This sentiment is repeated in reference to AMOY several more times throughout the DEIS, and a reference to PIPL on Page 66 of Chapter 2 reads "Pets should be leashed and under control of their owners at all times from March 15 to July 31 on beaches where PIPL are present or have traditionally nested. Pet's should be prohibited on these beaches from April 1 to August 31 if, based on observations and experience, pet owners fail to keep the pets leashed and under control" Nowhere in the DEIS cited studies for AMOY is there a mandate for total pet exclusion, only restraint. Also, out of the 12 National Seashores nationwide, on two deny pet entry, and both are bound to do so by Florida law, not species protection mandates. Per 2009 NPS field summaries on violations, the vast majority of closure violations involving dogs involve humans as well, as there are very few documented cases of unleashed dogs entering closures by themselves.

Make the penalties for violations severe, and enforce them, but do not deny access to the beloved members of our extended families for dubious reasons and unproven expectations. These portions of the DEIS are absolutely unacceptable, and should be stricken, as even the environmentally preferred Alternative D makes no mention of such drastic measures against our domesticated non-human family members.

Banning part of our extended family from our beaches cannot be allowed to happen. I disagree with the proposed management protocols set forth in both Alt's D & F, and instead support the protocols as set forth by the interim plan.

Fishing Management:

Having Cape Point closed for the majority of the summer season not only causes anglers to go elsewhere, but it puts the local merchants who cater to the fishing population at a huge disadvantage economically. While there may be many miles of other park shoreline open for angling, it's tantamount to going to Disneyland to be told all the major attractions are closed for the season. It's still useable, but the true attraction is now gone. May people are realizing this and not coming back to CHNSRA. Correct and prudent management of the habitat around the ephemeral ponds on Cape Point could negate the need to close this all-important visitor destination. I disagree with the proposed management protocols set forth in both Alt's D & F, and instead support the protocols as set forth by the interim plan.

Boating Management:

Boats are prohibited from landing within closures or SMA's, which creates a very dangerous situation for the boating public in the event of marine emergencies. On May 1, 2010, a human life was lost due to a capsized boat in Hatteras inlet. While only speculation, if beach users had been present that day on either point or spit to call in this accident, this loss of life may not have occurred. I disagree with the proposed management protocols set forth in both Alt's D & F, and instead support the protocols as set forth by the interim plan.

Watersports Management:

Kiteboarding has been banned within the boundaries of bird closures and SMA's, for dubious reasons. Kites are not predators to plovers, and the species will over time realize this fact and adapt accordingly. How long before surfing and windsurfing are also banned for the same nonexistent reasoning? I disagree with the proposed management protocols set forth in both Alt's D & F, and instead support the protocols as set forth by the interim plan.

Land Sports Management:

Kite flying within a certain distance of SMA's and closures has been banned, along with Frisbee and ball throwing. How long before horseshoes, bean-bag toss and Parcheesi are banned? I disagree with the proposed management protocols set forth in both Alt's D & F, and instead support the protocols as set forth by the interim plan.

Trash/Refuse Removal Management:

CHNSRA NPS staff is lucky in the fact that the ORV users remove almost every scrap of trash from beach daily, negating the need for an official NPS trash removal program within the seashore. Pedestrian beaches are another story, and areas that are closed to ORV's for a prolonged period of time show that pedestrians do not remove trash from the beaches, nor do any other user group other than ORV users. There are passages within the DEIS that suggest predators are attracted to the refuse left behind by ORV users, but this is imply not the case in CHNSRA, and these lines should be stricken from the FEIS. I disagree with the proposed management protocols set forth in both Alt's D & F, and instead support the protocols as set forth by the interim plan.

Habitat Management:

Talk of "Pilot Programs" needs to be replaced with true action items, for every growing season that passes predators are given more brush to hide within, thus negating all other resource management schemes. It is a widely accepted scientific fact that PIPL prefer the MOSH habitat of the salt ponds over that of the Cape Point beaches, yet the NPS is steadfast in not taking action in vegetation mitigation. It is done successfully in PINWR, why not within CHNSRA? I disagree with the proposed management protocols set forth in both Alt's D & F, and instead support the protocols as set forth by the interim plan, or those used by the USFWS in PINWR.

Predator Management:

Over 1,200 various predator species, have been "removed" from the CHNSRA habitat since the inception of the Consent Decree, that majority being "native" species. Not only has this huge expenditure in both life and resources shown no appreciable positive impacts toward protected species, it has

also led to less biodiversity within the CHNSRA animal kingdom. It is also a travesty to remove predator species from their habitat during their own breeding seasons, leaving behind countless litters of offspring to simply die of starvation. The early species management policies in CHNSRA also included mammalian creatures under the umbrella of protection. What has changed since that time? There can truly never be a predator-free ecosystem on these barrier islands, and it is misguided to attempt to make it such. I disagree with the proposed management protocols set forth in both Alt's D & F, and instead support the protocols as set forth by the interim plan.

Impacts:

-Environmental

The only negative environmental impacts created by ORV use are strictly species related, in particular with relation to nesting/breeding of bird species. Otherwise, pollution, noise, soil/sand/plant and viewshed impacts are long-term negligible, according to the DEIS.

-Socioeconomic

The plans set forth in Alternate F in the DEIS will have a much bigger socioeconomic impact than stated, as it will take a few years for the visiting public to sort out all the new regulations, and make the decision if they wish to return to an area that is so severely restricted.

-Cultural & Traditional

ORV's on the beach are a way of transportation and life that predates the inception of the park itself. Conrad Wirth went far to allay the concerns of the islanders in his open letter of the 1950's that this type of access would always be permitted. It was not until the era of overreaching environmental regulations that his promise died on the vine.

Conclusion:

The entire DEIS is a travesty, as it will negatively impact the island residents and visitors alike for the foreseeable future, if it goes through as designed under either Alt's D or F. Again, the park's enabling legislation states CHNSRA was created "for the benefit and enjoyment of the people". If either Alt's D or F, or a combination of the two are passed into law, this particular seashore will cease to operate under that requirement, and will become more akin to a National Wildlife Refuge than a Recreational Area.

Please do not allow this to happen to OUR seashore.

Alan Pitt Richmond, VA/Frisco. NC

Correspondence ID: 7037 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 10:43:50

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: 7038 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 10:43:50

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: 7039 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 10:43:50

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: 7040 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 10:43:50

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.

Indeed, it is beyond the time we should be active doing something.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: 7041 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 10:43:50

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: 7042 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 10:43:58
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: 7043 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 10:43:58
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: 7044 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 10:43:58
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.
 * Put Natural Resources First. Please--no ORV's all the year through on the 68 miles of Seashore beach at Cape Hatteras. Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 7045 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 10:43:58
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: 7046 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 10:44:04
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: 7047 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 10:44:04
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: 7048 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 10:44:04
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: 7049 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 10:44:04
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: 7050 **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.
PLEASE KEEP THE CARS OFF THE BEACHES!!!! My family and I are frequent visitors of the Cape and we HATE the cars. They are dangerous and I worry about my 3-year-old. We choose to walk along the beach and enjoy it for its natural beauty. Surely we can find a way that the year-round residents and fishermen can continue using their beach without destroying the native species and endangering visitors. (Perhaps some permitting system for locals?) If you choose poorly here, we will find some place else to take our tourism dollars. -JAK
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 7051 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 10:44:04
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.
The ORV community has been more organized and vocal in their opposition to Alternative D, but that does not mean their preference is what is right for the rest of the public or the environment, especially the rare animals that would be affected.
Please adopt Alternative D. Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this important issue.

Correspondence ID: 7052 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 10:44:23
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: 7053 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 10:44:25

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: 7054 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 10:44:25

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: 7055 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 10:44:25

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:	7056	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	
Name:	Schwester, E J					
Received:	Apr,23,2010 00:00:00					
Correspondence Type:	Letter					
Correspondence:	Mike Murray, Superintendent 4/23/2010 Cape Hatteras National Seashore 1401 National Park Drive Manteo, NC 27954 Dear Sir: We disagree with and whole heartedly oppose and fee based program (for ORV access) in any form to our beaches. With the recent stimulus grant to the NPS there is no earthly reason for additional money hardships to our beachgoers. We already have fishing license requirements for fisherman whom probably account for 90% of our beach use. Please, please, have this changed for the benefit of all affected. Thank you E.J. Schwester					
Correspondence ID:	7057	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	
Name:	Halstein, Francis					
Received:	Apr,25,2010 00:00:00					
Correspondence Type:	Letter					
Correspondence:	In reference to the NPS DEIS, I strongly disagree with both page 7 part 1 and chapter 2- alternative: accessibility for the disabled. It suggest with a special permit for areas in front of the villages that an ORV be allowed to transport disabled persons to the beach but must return the vehicle to the street. I do not understand this concept which would make for more beach driving rather than leave the vehicle with the party at the beach. Also about the boardwalks, this is of no use to someone who cannot walk distances nor ride in wheel chairs. My husband has disabilities that restrict him of either of these options. We are here to fish as we have been for many years. The only way we can do this is to take an ORV to the beach with our fishing equipment. Both my husband and I served in the armed forces to keep our shores free and now our freedoms are being taken from us from within our own government. The provisions offered are not-applicable to him and many other disabled tax paying Americans. Please give this serious consideration and I would like a solution to this not unique situation. Thank You, Francis Halstein					
Correspondence ID:	7058	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 ask that any plan that is approved will do the following: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones. Sincerely, Kelly Suttles?					
Correspondence ID:	7059	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	
Name:	McNair, Lynn					
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. We ask that any plan that is approved will do the following: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at					

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: 7060 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Thompson, Jasen
Received: May,07,2010 11:00:29
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am placing this comment to encourage the NPS to take a serious look into the economic impact in an all ready depressed economy and the impact on enjoying the island with fishing, relaxing and simply enjoying the beauty of the ocean when considering beach closures on the Cape Hatteras Seashore. My family and I purchased a residence on the island, 1 year ago, after having enjoyed 12+ years of vacationing on the island, we opted to purchase a home in Frisco over a home in Hawaii, simply because of the relaxed and easily accessed beaches where our children can enjoy playing in the surf and sand without the crowding that comes with limited beach access. We have also enjoyed the wildlife without noticeable human impact, including the evening hatching of a sea turtle nest. I find it very interesting as to why the park service feels the need to bow down to the special interest groups that are demanding the change from the NPS, who has enjoyed many years of benefit from the very people that respect and use the beach without harming the wildlife.

Correspondence ID: 7061 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 11:10:02
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Because the Park service Land borders the villages of Hatteras Island, they are small and not likely to get much larger, as there is no room to grow. This same factor limits the number of residents and visitors to the Island. My point is that there will never be that much traffic, that there is a need to shut it down, or even limit it.

Correspondence ID: 7062 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 11:10:37
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: 7063 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 11:10:37
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: 7064 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 11:10:38
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: 7065 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 11:10:38
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: 7066 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 11:10:43
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: 7067 **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.

I think ORV's can find other places to go that do not disrupt wildlife or access to quiet and natural beauty which are an important part of the parks. Having shared a path with dirt bikers, I am aware that the folks who enjoy riding dirt bikes and ORV's often like to push the limits, and trying to walk while watching to see that they didn't run into us was not pleasant. It entirely spoiled the idea of walking in the woods.

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.

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

Correspondence ID: 7068 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 11:10:49
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: 7069 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 11:10:49
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: 7070 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 11:10:49
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: 7071 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 11:10:49
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: 7072 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 11:10:49
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: 7073 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 11:10:49
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: 7074 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 11:10:54
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: 7075 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 11:10:54
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: 7076 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 11:10:55
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: 7077 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 11:10:55
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: 7078 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May.07.2010 11:11:00
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: 7079 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May.07.2010 11:11:00
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: 7080 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May.07.2010 11:11:00
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: 7081 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 11:11:00
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: 7082 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 11:11:06
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: 7083 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 11:11:06
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: 7084 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 11:11:06
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: 7085 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 11:11:11
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: 7086 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 11:11:11
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: 7087 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 11:11:12
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 principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
 Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
 Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are

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

Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until 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 know this issue is controversial. But I live on the Outer Banks and I still support this action.

Correspondence ID: 7088 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 11:11:12
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Sir or Madam,
Thank you for taking the time to read my letter. Cape Hatteras' Beach Access for ORV's should be kept open due to commerce. If they are not, our area will suffer an incredible financial loss that will affect all those who live here. Having the freedom to drive on the beach is one quality that makes Cape Hatteras unique and a tourist destination that attracts vacationers and their dollars season after season. The beaches of Cape Hatteras give an opportunity like no other for surf fishing, kite surfing, commercial fishing and horseback riding for tourists and for locals. An ample majority of visitors to the island come just for these activities. They come back year after year or several times a year, simply because these activities are allowed here and conditions are ideal.
In closing, if large portions of beaches were to be closed to public access, Cape Hatteras Island would lose major, financial and recreational qualities as well as the overall quality that makes it a special and unique escape for tourists and locals alike. Please think about what I have said and think about the welfare of the Hatteras Island community when making your decision.
Sincerely,
Alea Toledo

Correspondence ID: 7089 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: As a property owner and long-time resident of the Outer Banks, I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans, I support Alternative D presented in the draft environmental impact statement, if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which is important to me.
Should the Park Service not choose to enact Alternative D, the following principals should be the basis of the final plan:
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Correspondence ID: 7090 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Thanks 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, which are important to me.
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery.

Correspondence ID: 7091 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 11:11:17
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: 7092 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 11:11:17
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. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Correspondence ID: 7093 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 11:11:17
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: 7094 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 11:11:23
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be

implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Correspondence ID: 7095 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 11:11:23
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Correspondence ID: 7096 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 11:11:24
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: 7097 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: N/A, N/A
Received: May,07,2010 11:12:37
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please take into account what a significant economic effect this decision will have on this area. I am sure you can think of a way to protect the endangered species without endangering tourism in this area. Closed beaches might save some birds and turtles, but will destroy the lives of many locals. Keep the beaches open and raise awareness about nesting so that people are real careful! The birds and turtles will be fine, but us locals - we might not be. I am sure you can find common ground and keep the beaches open and preserve life on Hatteras Island as it has been for years. Please keep the beaches open!

Correspondence ID: 7098 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 11:13:38
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: 7099 **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.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 7100 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 11:13:38
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: 7101 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 11:13:38
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: 7102 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May.07.2010 11:13:38
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: 7103 **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.
Please protect our nation's natural heritage so that it will be here for future generations to enjoy! Although I understand the interests of ORV enthusiasts, ORV use is extremely destructive to fragile coastal habitats and must be limited to protect the natural treasures of Cape Hatteras in perpetuity. Longterm protection of resources is the primary goal that management plans must strive to ensure.
Thank you for the opportunity to comment. I look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 7104 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May.07.2010 11:13:38
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: 7105 **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.
When are you going to get it? We must act NOW to stop the destruction of our planet!
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it NOT choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families 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 favor CLOSING THE PARK TO ALL ORV'S, PERIOD!
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 7106 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May.07,2010 11:13:52
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.
To the NPS: I would like to add my voice as a member of the public to urge you to protect the habitat of waterbirds and other wildlife by banning the use of recreational vehicles on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore.
Thankyou, Rhona McLean

Correspondence ID: 7107 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May.07,2010 11:13:52
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: 7108 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May.07,2010 11:13:52
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: 7109 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 11:13:52
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: 7110 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 11:13:58
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: 7111 **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: 7112 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 11:14:09
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: 7113 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 11:14:09
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: 7114 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 11:14:10
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. Doing what we can is vital for their future.

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

Correspondence ID: 7115 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 11:14:10
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: 7116 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 11:14:17
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: 7117 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 11:14:17
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: 7118 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 11:14:17

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: 7119 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 11:14:17

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. I understand and appreciate that ORV users have rights, but they and all of us have a responsibility to protect our nation's natural resources and heritage.

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

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: 7120 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 11:14:17

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: 7121 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 11:14:18
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 have seen lots of damage to lands in Washington State from unregulated ORV's, and I thus know of what I write here. You must stop these motor-heards who have no concern whatsoever for wildlife. Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 7122 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 11:14:24
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: 7123 **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.
Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras national Seashore. Of the

alternative plans presented in the draft EIS, I support the "environmentally preferred" Alternative D. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, of critical importance to me.

The National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs does not represent a fair balance for all users or wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

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

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

Correspondence ID: 7124 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 11:14:24

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: 7125 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: Shumen, John D

Received: May,07,2010 11:16:38

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I have two homes on the outer banks and have been fishing for over thirty years from Hatteras to Duck. In all those times fishing on the beach, I have never seen anybody disrespecting the environment. Industry on the outer banks consists mostly of commercial and recreational fishing and real estate and vacations. I can understand your concern about the habitat on the island, but I think the amount of land you want to close is unreasonable. Not to mention, the natural disasters like storms, tidal flooding and predators. If you go ahead with these restrictions as they are, the economy on the outer banks will suffer. Thank you

Correspondence ID: 7126 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: Latham, Judith C

Received: May,07,2010 11:18:33

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I disagree with permanent closure of any portion of the seashore. The landscape is so changeable that it is impossible to know the long term effects of such a ruling. For example, if a storm erodes half of, say, Hatteras Inlet, will the park service simply move barricades to make up for what is lost and take away more recreation area?

I disagree with the NPS refusal to count birds on spoil islands or on Pea Island. I think they should count both.

I disagree with NPS's policy of not moving turtle nests. I believe turtle nests in overwash areas should be immediately moved.

I think the entire piping plover program is not cost effective, particularly during our current global financial crisis. The bird yield at Cape Hatteras is simply not material to survival of the species and I resent my tax dollars being used in this elaborate, intrusive, and extravagantly wasteful expenditure of resources.

I think this plan is preposterously long, deliberately complicated and is designed only to ensure higher legal fees for litigators and more government bureaucracy. It seems even fishermen need to lawyer up before enjoying their sport. It shouldn't be that complicated. There aren't enough park rangers under the current consent decree. I'd like to know how many additional rangers, trappers, and middle managers will need to be hired to administer the new plan.

Correspondence ID: 7127 **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,

Laura A. Kovatch OBPA member

Correspondence ID: 7128 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 11:40:41
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: 7129 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 11:40:41
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: 7130 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 11:40:41
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: 7131 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 11:40:43
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: 7132 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 11:40:44
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: 7133 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 11:40:45
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: 7134 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 11:40:45
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: 7135 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 11:40:45

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: 7136 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 11:40:45

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: 7137 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 11:40:51

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: 7138 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 11:40:51
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: 7139 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 11:40:51
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: 7140 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 11:40:52
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: 7141 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 11:40:52
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: 7142 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 11:40:53
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: 7143 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 11:40:53
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: 7144 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 11:40:59
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: 7145 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May.07,2010 11:41:01
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: 7146 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May.07,2010 11:41:01
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: 7147 **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 Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. 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 principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for only non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore must come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are

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

Correspondence ID: 7148 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 11:41:02
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: 7149 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 11:41:07
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: 7150 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 11:41:08
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: 7151 **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 minimal 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.

Correspondence ID: 7152 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I LIVE IN KDH!!! I AM TIRED OF READING THE NEWS OF 'OUR' SEALIFE OR MUSTANGS HAVE BEEN RAN OVER, THEIR NEST HAVE BEEN RAN OVER. NATIVES 7 WILDLIFE WERE HERE FIRST. HUMANS, YOU NEED TO SHARE. AND ENFORCE THE BEACH LAWS. THE LIFE GUARDS DO NOT. THEIR IS NO BEACH PATROL. PEOPLE TAKE THEIR PETS OUT IN HOT SAND, AND NO ONE DOES ANYTHING. PEOPLE DISOBEY GLASS/TRASH ON BEACH. WHAT MAKES YOU THINK, THAT YOU CNA CONTROL THEM WHILE THEY'RE DRIVING. AND PROB. DRUNK? ENFORCE BEACH DRVING, BEFORE WE LOOSE EVERYTHING THAT NC HAS TO BE PROUD OF!!! NC., YOU NEED TO APPRECIATE DEFENDERS' HELP, AND THERE IS PLENTY OF ROOM FOR ANGLERS, HUMANS DO NOT NEED THE WHOLE BEACH! AND ALL THE TIME. ALLOW THE EGGS TO BE HATCHED, ALLOW THEM TIME & SPACE, & GIVE THEM ROOM TO MAKE IT TO THEIR HOME- THE SEA. PROTECT OUR PONIES/MUSTANGS. ENFORCE THE BEACH LAWS!!!, IT'S MOSTLY NOT EVEN THE NATIVES BREAKING THE LAWS, SO POST MORE SIGNS FOR THE TOURISTS!! I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

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

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

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

Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones. PATTI, CALEB, DELLIE, GREG, STACY & SAMUEL BASS 101 POST OAK COURT, KILL DEVIL HILLS, NC, 27948

Correspondence ID: 7153 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 11:41:13

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: 7154 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 11:41:14

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: 7155 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 11:41:14
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: 7156 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 11:41:15
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: 7157 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 11:41:15
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: 7158 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 11:41:21
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: 7159 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 11:41:22
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: We appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, we support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
We have spent our vacation every summer for decades on the Outer Banks and could not feel anymore strongly about all of this.
Howard & Mary Guld

Correspondence ID: 7160 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 11:41:22
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: 7161 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 11:41:22
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: 7162 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 11:41:23
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Correspondence ID: 7163 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 11:41:29
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: 7164 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 11:41:29
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: 7165 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 11:41:30
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Correspondence ID: 7166 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 11:41:38
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: 7167 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 11:41:41
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: 7168 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 11:41:42
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: 7169 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 11:41:48
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: 7170 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 11:41:52
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: 7171 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 11:41:53
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: 7172 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 11:41:53
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: 7173 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 11:43:36
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: 7174 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 11:43:36
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: 7175 **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.
Natural resources are my primary concern. Habitat protection and the providing of space for breeding, migrating, and wintering birds and other local species should be protected. Off-road vehicles not only destroy flora and fauna in the areas they traverse, but they also pollute the atmosphere in general and the air nearby, and then there's the noise pollution they create. I would prefer that ORVs be prohibited from areas of scenic beauty and places that are home to many species, animal and vegetable, and relegated to places that humans have already despoiled.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 7176 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 11:43:57
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: 7177 **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 one who loves the outdoors and wildlife, I am writing to support the National Park Services' efforts to protect nesting birds and turtles on Cape Hatteras National Seashore by managing ORV use.
I prefer the plan with the highest impact on environmental protection, which I understand to be 'D'. What is important to me in this plan is that it sets aside areas of the Seashore for non-ORV use so that people and wildlife can enjoy the Seashore's natural resources without high-impact disturbance. The oil spill in the Gulf of Mexico has made it ever more apparent to me that we must protect our areas of natural beauty, and our wildlife, from man-made disasters and impacts. Then perhaps they will have a better chance of survival when the natural disasters come along.
Thank you for your consideration.

Correspondence ID: 7178 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 11:43:58

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: 7179 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 11:43:58

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: 7180 **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 and my family.

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

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

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

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

Here in Michigan, we are beginning to understand the consequences to our tourism economy of failing to provide adequate protection to the environment along our tremendous Lake Michigan shoreline with its awesome sand dunes. We hope you will not make a similar mistake.

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

Correspondence ID: 7181 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 11:44:08
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: 7182 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 11:44:09
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: 7183 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 11:44:09
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: 7184 **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 nesting birds and sea turtles, which are important to me. ORVs are highly destructive, destroy nests and diminish the reproductive success of several beach-nesting animals who are suffering enough from habitat loss and degradation.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under Alternative F, prohibition of ORVs on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 7185 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May.07.2010 11:44:09
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: 7186 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May.07.2010 11:44:09
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: 7187 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 11:44:18
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: 7188 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 11:44:18
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: 7189 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 11:44:18
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: 7190 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 11:44:18

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: 7191 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: van Dorsten, Peter H

Received: May,07,2010 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the plan to manage off road vehicle (ORV) use on the Cape Hatteras National Seashore. I urge you to adopt the "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if it is modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

Any plan that is approved should contain the following:

1. Equal Access for All Users and Wildlife. Please limit ORV access to no more than 50% of the beach year round and provide more walkways and access facilities like public parking away from the beach. This will allow wildlife a chance to rebound to traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
2. The first principal should be to protect the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore. Recreational use should be consistent with this protection. Alternative D should be amended to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection should be based on the best scientific information, so funding studies to establish what works best should also be part of whatever alternative is selected. Wildlife disturbance buffers in Alternative D should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
3. Establish and Meet Clear Goals and milestones for Wildlife Recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.?

Thank you for listening.

Correspondence ID: 7192 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: Johnston, Lynn

Received: May,07,2010 11:58:59

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: After reading the draft of the DEIS I would like to remind everyone that 50% of Hatteras Island is already a nature sancturay and that people and pets have a right to enjoy the ocean too. Further restricting the rights of people going to the beach & having their pets with them would destroy the very fiber of why Hatteras is so special and why so many visitors come each year. Pleae take this into consideration and do not further restrict people & pets from the beach, the animals will find a non inhabited place to lay their eggs & then we can all coexist.

Correspondence ID: 7193 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 12:01:39

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Count me among the many who believe strongly that the current and proposed management policy is too restrictive to ORVs. I have been visiting Cape Hatteras National Seashore for over forty years. I have been able to enjoy it's beauty and splendor to its fullest. I believe there is a happy medium in mangament and we are far from that with the current and proposed closures. I am changing my life and returning to school to get a docotorate in Marine Ecology from The University of North Carolina and intend to fight for the rights of recreational users of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. You will hear from me again in the future, I assure you.

Correspondence ID: 7194 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 12:10:42

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: 7195 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May.07,2010 12:10:43
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: 7196 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May.07,2010 12:10:43
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: The orv users are thrill seekers and don't care about the rare bird and turtles nests they are destroying. they can keep orv off the beaches.
I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Correspondence ID: 7197 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May.07,2010 12:10:48
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: 7198 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:10:48
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: 7199 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:10:48
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: 7200 **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
Sincerely, Wendy Friend of Defenders P.O. Box 1731 Tappahannock, VA 22560-1731 United States Defender's Home Privacy Policy Contact Us
Donate Now ? Copyright 2010, Defenders of Wildlife 1130 17th Street NW | Washington, DC 20036 Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Correspondence ID: 7201 **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. Why the ORV users believe they should have use of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore for recreation rather than allowing the wildlife there to survive, is beyond me. Whichever plan is chosen, severe penalties for misuse by ORV and non-ORV users must be fully enforced.

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: 7202 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 12:10:53

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: 7203 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 12:10:59

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: 7204 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 12:10:59

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: 7205 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 12:11:04

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: 7206 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 12:11:04

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: 7207 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: Garcia, Armando A

Received: May,07,2010 12:11:07

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the

pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7208 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:11:08
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: 7209 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:11:10
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: 7210 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:11:10
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: 7211 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:11:10

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: 7212 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y**Name:** private**Received:** May,07,2010 12:11:10**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: 7213 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y**Name:** private**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00**Correspondence Type:** Web Form**Correspondence:**

As a native North Carolinian and lover of nature especially in a pristine setting, I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. When I visit a place of natural beauty such as Cape Hatteras, the experience is greatly diminished when large portions of the park are open to environmentally unfriendly (and usually noisy) practices such as widespread ORV usage. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: 7214 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y**Name:** private**Received:** May,07,2010 12:11:16**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: 7215 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:11:16
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: 7216 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:11:16
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. Please protect my state's seashore and wildlife for my children and grandchildren and for our state's tourism income. This is your job. Please do it for me!

Correspondence ID: 7217 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:11:16
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: 7218 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:11:16
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: 7219 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Dickinson, Robert
Received: May,07,2010 12:11:18
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7220 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:11:22
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: 7221 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 12:11:22
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: 7222 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:11:22
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: 7223 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:11:24
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: 7224 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:11:24
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: 7225 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:11:24
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: 7226 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:11:29
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: 7227 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:11:30
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent

degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Correspondence ID: 7228 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:11:30
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Correspondence ID: 7229 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: mankowski, craig s
Received: May,07,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.
***** Thank you very much for taking the time to protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again!
Sincerely,
craig

Correspondence ID: 7230 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7231 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:12:12
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.
Sincerely, Sara Avery

Correspondence ID: 7232 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Marcus, Christina
Received: May,07,2010 12:12:12
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7233 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Knight, James A
Received: May,07,2010 12:12:18
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.
-James Knight

Correspondence ID: 7234 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: spakowski, jeff
Received: May,07,2010 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence:

Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

***** Thank you very much for taking the time to protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again!

Sincerely, Jeff Spakowski

Correspondence ID: 7235 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: Greenwood, James G

Received: May,07,2010 12:12:21

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: With the exception of police and emergency vehicles there's no reason for other vehicles on any beach.

Correspondence ID: 7236 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: Selvage, Kimberly

Received: May,07,2010 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

***** Thank you very much for taking the time to protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again!

Sincerely,

Kimberly Selvage

Correspondence ID: 7237 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: Silver, Dan

Received: May,07,2010 12:12:27

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and

analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7238 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Silvey, Kevin
Received: May,07,2010 12:12:34
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.
Sincerely,
Mr. Kevin Silvey 9263 78th Place North Seminole, Florida 33777-4013

Correspondence ID: 7239 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: N/A, N/A
Received: May,07,2010 12:12:39
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7240 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Fredsti, Dana
Received: May,07,2010 12:12:41
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: What with events like the recent oil spill, we don't need any help screwing up the natural beauty of our coastlines. PLEASE do not open Cape Hatteras to off-road vehicles!

Correspondence ID: 7241 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:12:52
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: DONT LET OFF ROAD VEHICLES DOMINATE CAPE HATTERAS NATIONAL SEASHORE!

Correspondence ID: 7242 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Gaebe, Gail
Received: May,07,2010 12:12:52
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please protect the few natural areas still in existence from motorized traffic. There are a number of lovely areas already open for motorized traffic.

Correspondence ID: 7243 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Reynolds, Jonelle
Received: May,07,2010 12:13:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please preserve this and honor it free of invasion and violation with off road vehicles thank you

Correspondence ID: 7244 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Klausing, Michael L
Received: May,07,2010 12:13:05
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
- 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7245 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:13:06
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
- 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7246 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Deal, Jeffrey G
Received: May,07,2010 12:13:16
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I seek an ORV management plan that places greater emphasis on pedestrian access and wildlife management, especially with regard to endangered sea turtles and shorebirds.

Correspondence ID: 7247 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Macdonald, Lisa
Received: May,07,2010 12:13:33
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
- 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.
Kind regards, Lisa Macdonald

Correspondence ID: 7248 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:13:34
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7249 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Kramer, Kelly A
Received: May,07,2010 12:14:03
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
PRESERVE A FEW PLACES IN AMERICA TO REMAIN TRULY NATURAL & WITHOUT MAN'S IMPRINT!
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7250 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Schmitt, David J
Received: May,07,2010 12:14:07
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7251 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:14:08
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: There is no reason for the "play babies" to ride their off road vehicles in this area when there are enough legal places for them to ride as it is.

Correspondence ID: 7252 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.
***** Thank you very much for taking the time to protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again!
Sincerely,
Ron McGill

Correspondence ID: 7253 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Hopkins, Amy
Received: May,07,2010 12:14:13
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.
Thank you very much for taking the time to protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again!
Sincerely,
Amy Hopkins

Correspondence ID: 7254 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Correspondence ID:	7255	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,07,2010 12:14:14						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	Despite growth and change, there are still many beaches to choose from when selecting a vacation destination. So many of us treasure the Outer Banks because there are protected areas that are safe and free from vehicles. This is of benefit to us as visitors, but more importantly, wildlife is safe - and they have few places left that are safe. Please don't let the Hatteras National Seashore become one more place that we lose wildlife. Become part of the solution, not the problem!						
Correspondence ID:	7256	Project:	10641	Document:	32596		
Name:	N/A, N/A						
Received:	May,07,2010 12:14:15						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	Please do not approve an Off Road Vehicle (ORV) management plan for Cape Hatteras National Seashore as it will disproportionately dedicate beach use to year-round ORV traffic at the expense of wildlife and pedestrian visitors. We need to protect wildlife habitats from harmful activities such as off road vehicles. Nature is precious - please don't allow this.						
Correspondence ID:	7257	Project:	10641	Document:	32596		
Name:	Tatum, Beth						
Received:	May,07,2010 12:14:15						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.						
Correspondence ID:	7258	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,07,2010 12:14:15						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.						
Correspondence ID:	7259	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,07,2010 12:14:16						
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: 7260 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: N/A, N/A
Received: May,07,2010 12:14:16
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Off Road Vehicles have no place on fragile beaches! They should be restricted to use by Park personnel for Park business - NOT for recreational use. They would rapidly erode the already endangered ecosystems of these valuable natural resources.

Correspondence ID: 7261 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:14:17
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: 7262 **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.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 7263 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:14:17
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: 7264 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:14:17
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: We need to keep Cape Hatteras beaches free of vehicles!

Correspondence ID: 7265 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:14:18
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: 7266 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:14:18
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: 7267 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:14:18

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I have vacationed three times in the Cape Hatteras region and would be very disappointed if off road vehicles were given free reign to the beach front. These machines completely disrupt the natural beauty and rhythm of the seashore. I advice you to strongly consider banning these vehicles from the beachfront.

Correspondence ID: 7268 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 12:14:18

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: 7269 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 12:14:18

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.

Please do not allow Off Road Vehicles on our beaches. They cause erosion, destroy the dune strata, kills plants that provide food and shelter for certain species. They cause ruts in which sea turtle hatchlings can get stranded in and they are disturbing to people who are visiting by foot.

They have no respect for our natural environment and I urge you to keep the beaches closed. I visit the outer banks frequently and I am opposed to beach driving.

Sadly enough, if the beaches are closed to one group they must be closed to all.

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

Correspondence ID: 7270 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 12:14:25

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.

Dear Superintendent Murray,

I appreciate all you are doing to conserve wildlife in Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Numbers of shorebirds such as Piping Plover, Least Tern, and Gull-billed Tern, which all used to nest in good numbers on the NC coast have fallen drastically, and action needed to be taken, so thank you for that. In addition, you have left large areas of beach open to ORV users who, while a small minority of the users of the seashore, still deserve to be allowed to use it, and this you have done for them. Any further actions by them to try and open up these beaches not only endangers the wildlife but also infringes on the rights of non-ORV users. Thank you for your consideration, and keep our beaches among the most pristine and beautiful in the world!

Sincerely,

Robert Meehan 2712 Spencer St Durham, NC 27705

Correspondence ID: 7271 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: Keiser, John L

Received: May,07,2010 12:14:33

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

John L. Keiser

Correspondence ID: 7272 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: McGoldrick, Bill
Received: May.07,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.
***** Thank you very much for taking the time to protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again!
Sincerely,
Bill McGoldrick

Correspondence ID: 7273 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May.07,2010 12:14:46
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: There is no reason for the "play babies" to ride their off road vehicles in this area when there are enough legal places for them to ride as it is.

Correspondence ID: 7274 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May.07,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.
***** Thank you very much for taking the time to protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again!
Sincerely,
A concerned citizen

Correspondence ID: 7275 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May.07,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
As a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina.
All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over any other visitors. Overall, this approach is

unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7276 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:14:48
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: 7277 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:14:50
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please adopt a modified Alternative D of the draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Off Road Vehicle (ORV) management plan for Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Doing so will protect that which makes Cape Hatteras so special--abundant (and endangered) wildlife and the natural quiet of miles of pristine Atlantic seashore. Not doing so will disproportionately dedicate beach use to year-round ORV traffic at the expense of wildlife and pedestrian visitors.

Correspondence ID: 7278 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:14:51
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: PLEASE DISALLOW OFF ROAD VEHICLES ON CAPE HATTARAS. RIDICULOUS THOUGHT TO BEGIN WITH. Let's protect nature.

Correspondence ID: 7279 **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.

We have known that ORV'S are destructive to the environment since the sixties; why do we continue to debate this issue, and since when do "individual rights" supercede the rights of the majority of us who do not go "off road" and who are concerned about our mutual environment. It is time that we reestablish a balanced reading of our "rights." The framers of our constitution, I'm sure, had no vision of this type of activity!

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

Correspondence ID: 7280 **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. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 7281 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:14:52
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: 7282 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Wadsworth, Don and Gwenn L
Received: May,07,2010 12:15:09
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: We have witness the destruction that off road vehicles have caused across our country, please no more!!!! Thanks!

Correspondence ID: 7283 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Lyda, Mary
Received: May,07,2010 12:15:10
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Off road vehicles do not belong on beaches where people walk. They disrupt the ecosystem and disturb other peoples' peace and enjoyment of the area.

Correspondence ID: 7284 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:15:10
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: 7285 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 12:15:11

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.

I'm sure the canned message was terrific, but my two cents are mine. My family and I have vacationed in the Outer Banks for many years now. Through the years I have seen commercialization and building going on at an ever increasing growth rate, it's almost exponential. The housing going up are mini-mansions. The Outer Banks is prime vacation territory. However, one of the reasons that makes it so desirable is the openness of the beaches, the beautiful dunes and scenery. It exudes peace, safety & tranquility. When you paint the picture in your mind, off-road vehicles are NOT present. I would like to see them banned. I have also been up in Corolla and see how many vehicles get stuck because the drivers do not know how to drive. I enjoy reading in my chair and watching little kids run around chasing the tide in and out while their parents keep an eye on them. I like to see the sand castles being built. I could go on and on, please contact me if you want more. I would like to see a couple of things happen. First, ban off-road vehicles. If it is absolutely necessary have a special 7-day license or seasonal license to purchase with a written test before doling them out. I loved the old visitor center before the lighthouse was moved. It was charming, quaint with the big front porch and very inviting. The new one is glossy, commercial, with a get-in, get-out atmosphere. Here's you can accomplish genuine change. You need to change the atmosphere back to make about the very special Outer Banks and not a gift shop with a few exhibits thrown in. I would suggest a webcam of a few of the secluded sites where visitors can see (but not touch or visit) the endangered species. Here is where you can educate people on why they should take care of our endangered species.. It's very difficult to care about something you know little or nothing about. I am very passionate about this topic. Environment and the education of the public. Heck, I went and got my degree in Environmental Science because of it. You need to develop an adoption program. Again, I can easily expound on this, just give a call. I want my grandchildren to have the opportunity my son had. Dear Superintendent Murray, please help to make it happen.

Correspondence ID: 7286 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 12:15:11

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: 7287 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 12:15:12

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: 7288 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Hoisington, Chuck
Received: May,07,2010 12:15:12
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: No vehicles on Cape Hatteras beach!

Correspondence ID: 7289 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:15:12
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: 7290 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:15:14
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: 7291 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:15:14
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: 7292 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Lurie-Janicki, Ellaine
Received: May,07,2010 12:15:16
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7293 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:15:16
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7294 **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.

However, with that said, please consider your decisions 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 impacts 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,
Michael McDonnell

Correspondence ID: 7295 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Oswald, Sarah
Received: May,07,2010 12:15:34
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
- 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7296 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:15:34
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence:

I emphatically ask that you do not go forward with plans to allow Off Road Vehicles on Cape Hatteras. As a child growing up on the East Coast, I spent several summers at the Cape, vacationing with my family. My memories from there are splendid -- we camped and enjoyed a quiet get-away from our typically fast-paced lives.

Please do not spoil this wonderful experience for future children. We need places that are quiet, that are peaceful, that are not crowded with motor vehicles. Nature is spoiled so quickly when vehicles are permitted to make new paths and scare-off wildlife.

Please keep the Cape as majestic as it currently is. Please give our nation's children and families the opportunity to enjoy quiet, beautiful Cape Hatteras. Thank you for your consideration.

Correspondence ID: 7297 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:15:34
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: 7298 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Wingate, Julie
Received: May,07,2010 12:15:34
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with

its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
- 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Respectfully Submitted,
Julie Wingate Blackstone, MA

Correspondence ID:	7299	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,07,2010 12:15:34						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	ORVS should be prohibited or greatly restricted in order to preserve the Cape Hatteras National Seashore. ORVs emit exhaust, at times leak oil & gas, and the noise drives away the animals who use the Seashore as their habitat.						
Correspondence ID:	7300	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	
Name:	DeBruton, Noel C						
Received:	May,07,2010 12:15:35						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	Leave well enough alone!						
Correspondence ID:	7301	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,07,2010 12:15:35						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	<p>Over the years I have spent many summers on Cape Hatteras, it's a truly unique place, and I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. <p>Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.</p>						
Correspondence ID:	7302	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,07,2010 12:15:35						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	<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"> *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones. 						

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

Correspondence ID: 7303 **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 spent vacations in the Outer Banks for the primary purpose of viewing wildlife. I have stayed a local hotels, enjoyed restaurants in the area, and shopped at local stores. Wildlife should be protected not only because it is a beautiful part of our national heritage, but also because of the beneficial economic impacts. This is a unique place that deserves protection - for those who love it now and for future generations.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 7304 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May.07,2010 12:15:36
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: 7305 **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 fully support the information below. As a Californian who has lived at a southern California beach area during much of my childhood and who visits beaches in California and Oregon often, I am aware of the destruction to soils and wildlife caused by unrestricted use of ORVs on beaches and adjacent areas. The alternative plan D or the principles below, if included in the final plan would allow a fair amount of use for ORVs while allowing quiet beach use for others and particularly help protect wildlife in the ORV restricted areas.
Please put my name on your mailing list for updates. Thank you.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: 7306 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:15:36
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: 7307 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:15:36
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: 7308 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Zawaski, Joan
Received: May,07,2010 12:16:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

0010937

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.
As a bird watching visitor who cares about the condition of wildlife, I can tell you that these vehicles absolutely ruin the beach experience for walkers and are deadly to the local wildlife, which includes many threatened and endangered species.

Correspondence ID:	7309	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	
Name:	Saito, Don M					
Received:	May,07,2010 12:16:01					
Correspondence Type:	Web Form					
Correspondence:	Loud, polluting, and generally obnoxious ORVs have no place in our national parks. Do not allow them in, so everyone *else* can enjoy the natural sights and sounds of the land.					

Correspondence ID:	7310	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private: Y
Name:	private					
Received:	May,07,2010 12:16:01					
Correspondence Type:	Web Form					
Correspondence:	Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan. Thank you, S. Etherton					

Correspondence ID:	7311	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private: Y
Name:	private					
Received:	May,07,2010 00:00:00					
Correspondence Type:	Web Form					
Correspondence:	RE Cape Hatteras National Seashore, I urge you to follow the NPCA ORV management plan that places greater emphasis on pedestrian access and wildlife management, especially with regard to endangered sea turtles and shorebirds. Please adopt a modified Alternative D of the draft Environmental Impact Statement, protecting that which makes Cape Hatteras so special--abundant (and endangered) wildlife and the natural quiet of miles of pristine Atlantic seashore. Carol Czajkowski					

Correspondence ID:	7312	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private: Y
Name:	private					
Received:	May,07,2010 12:16:20					
Correspondence Type:	Web Form					
Correspondence:	As a frequent visitor to the Outer Banks I find it hard to fathom that anyone would allow off road vehicles or regular automobiles onto the pristine areas the are so ecologically vital and are also so economically viable to North Carolina. DO NOT allow this to happen. The risks far outweigh the benefits especially the loss of tourism dollars! Thank you for your serious consideration.					

Correspondence ID:	7313	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	
Name:	Mackewich, Susan					
Received:	May,07,2010 12:16:20					
Correspondence Type:	Web Form					
Correspondence:	Please limit the number of off road vehicles, in Cape Hatteras and the surrounding area. This is a precious, natural environment which is being destroyed by too many off road vehicles and careless visitors.					

Correspondence ID:	7314	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	
Name:	malone, judith a					
Received:	May,07,2010 12:16:24					
Correspondence Type:	Web Form					
Correspondence:	Please preserve the Atlantic Coast beaches for the "native Americans", the wildlife that have inhabited this area long before humans arrived. With the current crisis of the oil contaminating much of the Gulf Coast, and possibly traveling up the east coast with the Gulf Current, it is more critical than ever to protect any and all uncontaminated habitat of all wildlife that are dependent upon these areas for their survival.					

Correspondence ID:	7315	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private: Y
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------	-------------------

Name: private
Received: May.07,2010 12:16:24
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
 As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.
 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."
 Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7316 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May.07,2010 12:16:29
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
 As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.
 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."
 Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.
 Thank you, Lori Livermore

Correspondence ID: 7317 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May.07,2010 12:16:29
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please protect our land from the noise and pollutants that stem from on- and off-road vehicles. Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 7318 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Barella, Frank M
Received: May.07,2010 12:16:30
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Folks..have you noticed the oil slick in the Gulf of Mexico? Why would you increase the use of motorized vehicles when it is quite clear that we need to start REDUCING our use of oil and oil products. Furthermore, mother nature is not building new habitats and we are already losing existing habitats at an alarming rate. Lastly we are being swept by an epidemic of obesity and riding motorized vehicles only encourages obesity. If people are so damn lazy they have to use motorized vehicles to visit these precious places them let them stay home!

Correspondence ID: 7319 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Esposito, Dan J
Received: May.07,2010 12:16:31
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please adopt a modified Alternative D of the draft Environmental Impact Statement, protecting that which makes Cape Hatteras so special--abundant (and endangered) wildlife and the natural quiet of miles of pristine Atlantic seashore.
 Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 7320 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May.07,2010 12:16:31
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
 As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with

its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Sincerely,
M. Ziolkowski

Correspondence ID:	7321	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,07,2010 12:16:31						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	There have to be some quiet sanctuaries left that don't have motorized vehicles zooming and roaring around, spewing noise and gasoline pollution!! Please do NOT allow ORVs on Cape Hatteras.						
Correspondence ID:	7322	Project:	10641	Document:	32596		
Name:	dawson, dan						
Received:	May,07,2010 12:16:37						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	Please keep our peaceful places from becoming littered with noise and pollution						
Correspondence ID:	7323	Project:	10641	Document:	32596		
Name:	Matusek, Lynda						
Received:	May,07,2010 12:16:42						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	Please do not allow ORVs to degrade the Cape Hatteras environment; the beaches are fragile and need to be protected for the native flora and fauna as well as the visitors who want to enjoy the area in it's more natural state. The negative impact of ORVs is huge. I have visited Cape Hatteras and appreciated the sound of the waves, the wind and the birds. I could smell the ocean. I could be an observer with little impact on the environment. None of that would be true if ORVs are allowed to drive through these areas. Thank you for you consideration. Lynda Matusek						
Correspondence ID:	7324	Project:	10641	Document:	32596		
Name:	N/A, N/A						
Received:	May,07,2010 12:16:48						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	Unless a person is handicapped, no one should use an offroad vehicle in such an area. People should walk and exercise more and appreciate what is around them.						
Correspondence ID:	7325	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,07,2010 12:16:56						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.						
Correspondence ID:	7326	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,07,2010 12:16:56						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						

Correspondence:

Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. The silence of Cape Hatteras is in danger and must be protected. ORVs are loud and stress wildlife. ORVs cannot be part of a positive primitive visitor experience.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID:	7327	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	
Name:	N/A, N/A					
Received:	May,07,2010 00:00:00					
Correspondence Type:	Web Form					
Correspondence:	Save the beaches!!!					
Correspondence ID:	7328	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	
Name:	N/A, N/A					
Received:	May,07,2010 12:17:00					
Correspondence Type:	Web Form					
Correspondence:	Please do not allow ORV's to ruin what it now a a unique and beautifyl place. Our country is so blessed. Don't take away something that all Americans have enjoyed for many years. Thank you.					
Correspondence ID:	7329	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private: Y
Name:	private					
Received:	May,07,2010 12:17:00					
Correspondence Type:	Web Form					
Correspondence:	Adopt a modified Alternative D of the draft Environmental Impact Statement, protecting that which makes Cape Hatteras so special--abundant (and endangered) wildlife and the natural quiet of miles of pristine Atlantic seashore. WHY ARE WE OFFERING OUR PRISTINE PLACES OF QUIET BEAUTY TO MORE NOISY, OFF ROAD VEHICLES? WHAT IS WRONG WITH YOU PEOPLE? DO YOU NOT SEE THE VALUE OF RECREATIONAL AREAS UNLESS THEY ARE OVERRUN WITH SOME KIND OF LOUD, POLLUTING, MONSTROSITIES? THIS IS NOT RECREATION. IT IS DESTRUCTION AND MUST NOT BE ALLOWED.					
Correspondence ID:	7330	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	
Name:	Craig, Ella M					
Received:	May,07,2010 12:17:08					
Correspondence Type:	Web Form					
Correspondence:	Please don't allow off-road vehicles on the beach. People will be killed or injured, and wildlife will suffer.					
Correspondence ID:	7331	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	
Name:	Johnson, David G					
Received:	May,07,2010 12:17:21					
Correspondence Type:	Web Form					
Correspondence:	Please do not endanger the wildlife here on the beach!					
Correspondence ID:	7332	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	
Name:	Webb, Kimberly					
Received:	May,07,2010 12:17:40					
Correspondence Type:	Web Form					
Correspondence:	Please keep our beaches clean and quiet for wildlife and the people. There is already enough noise in the world. People need a retreat from noise! And so do the animals.					
Correspondence ID:	7333	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	
Name:	Prentice, Sister Letitia					
Received:	May,07,2010 12:17:41					
Correspondence Type:	Web Form					
Correspondence:	Beaches are not for vehicles-but people					
Correspondence ID:	7334	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	
Name:	Margeson, Don W					
Received:	May,07,2010 00:00:00					
Correspondence Type:	Web Form					
Correspondence:	Dear Superintendent Murray, Please insure there is an appropriate balance that protect nesting birds and wildlife as well as recreational activities.					

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

***** Thank you very much for taking the time to protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again!

Sincerely,

Correspondence ID: 7335 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Lewis, Suzanne
Received: May,07,2010 12:17:43
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." I urge you to please keep this area a wilderness for future generations.
Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 7336 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Terhune, Greg
Received: May,07,2010 12:17:43
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7337 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Peck, Naomi
Received: May,07,2010 12:17:44
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7338 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May.07.2010 12:17:44
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.
Sincerely,
Laurie Schick

Correspondence ID: 7339 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Backman, Karen Hedwig
Received: May.07.2010 12:17:45
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please!
No further damage to our environment by noisy and polluting gas-driven off road vehicles.

Correspondence ID: 7340 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Steckervetz, Lori L
Received: May.07.2010 12:17:45
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Off-road vehicles disturb both the other public users of the park as well as the wildlife and habitat, they help contribute pollutants to the air and water and produce what I would consider noise pollution. Please prevent these tragic outcomes by limiting off-road vehicles in the Cape Hatteras National Seashore!

Correspondence ID: 7341 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Ruiz, O. E
Received: May.07.2010 12:17:45
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7342 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May.07.2010 12:17:45
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take

precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7343 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:17:45
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please do not allow the fragile wetlands of Cape Hatteras to be damaged by allowing off-road vehicles to use them.

Correspondence ID: 7344 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:17:46
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Natural areas are for peace and quiet! No off road vehicles, please!

Correspondence ID: 7345 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Mantas, Nicholas A
Received: May,07,2010 12:17:47
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7346 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: N/A, N/A
Received: May,07,2010 12:17:47
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
As both a supporter and user of national parks, I want to express my objection to allowing ORV on Cape Hatteras. We recently visited the area and loved the views and the birds of course. ORV's destroy and erode the land, not to mention the air and noise pollutions they cause.
Thanks for listening... hong and sunnie son

Correspondence ID: 7347 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:17:48
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing

an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID:	7348	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,07,2010 12:17:50						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	There is no sane reason to allow Off Road Vehicles in National Parks. These public lands are meant to be a refuge for wildlife and humans alike, away from the air and noise pollution of off road vehicles. Off-roaders have plenty of other places to play with their noisy, polluting vehicles without making National Park lands available to them.						
Correspondence ID:	7349	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	
Name:	N/A, N/A						
Received:	May,07,2010 12:17:57						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	allowing any kind of vehicle on a beach pretty much destroys what most people treasure a beach for, not to mention the environmental damage. don't do it!						
Correspondence ID:	7350	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,07,2010 12:17:57						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. In my opinion, off-road vehicles don't belong on any beach or seashore, let alone something that is part of the national park system, or in any way protected. Please make plans that keep vehicles off the beaches.						
Correspondence ID:	7351	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	
Name:	Potucek, Kimberly A						
Received:	May,07,2010 12:18:01						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.						
Correspondence ID:	7352	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	
Name:	Putnam, Andrew						
Received:	May,07,2010 12:18:02						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	Dear Superintendent Murray, I am writing to encourage you to keep the Cape Hatteras National Seashore free from offroad vehicle use. The vehicles severely damage wildlife and native vegetation, as can be seen on the beaches of Western Washington. Please keep off road vehicle use limited. Cape Hatteras is a beautiful park, and I would hate to see it damaged in the way the beaches of Washington have been damaged. Sincerely, Andrew Putnam 8153 4th Ave SW Seattle, WA 98115						
Correspondence ID:	7353	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,07,2010 12:18:04						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	This is my second attempt to send a note. I am in favor of keeping the beaches open and free as they were intended to be as a "Recreational Area" Cape Hatteras national Recreational Area is not a bird preserve. I favor its return to the people who recreate there. I protest the obvious vendetta against ORV use, and recreational use, in favor of thinly veiled "protection" for non endangered species. I feel Judge Boyle should have been taken off the case as he is obviously prejudiced against the intended uses of the National Seashore of the past. I believe the economic and recreational intentions of the seashore should be maintained. Best available science should be used..not subjective emotional science by prejudiced environmentalists.. I have sent a prior note with more information..but it was refused by the national park site..hmm Bob Mead.						
Correspondence ID:	7354	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	
Name:	Gannon, john F. f						

Received: May,07,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: get them away

Correspondence ID: 7355 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: krick, jessica
Received: May,07,2010 12:18:06
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
- 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7356 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:18:08
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
- 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7357 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Gay, Larry
Received: May,07,2010 12:18:10
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
- 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7358 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Burch, Robert J

Received: May,07,2010 12:18:23

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Yours truly,

Robert J. Burch

Correspondence ID: 7359 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: Snyder, William H

Received: May,07,2010 12:18:24

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7360 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: Dickey, Charles

Received: May,07,2010 12:18:25

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: It is of vital importance that Hatteras National Seashore be protected from the incredible damage being done by excessive use of ATV's. The reason this area was made a national seashore was to protect and preserve it for all of us to enjoy, not for it to be torn apart by a small group of ignorant morons on ATV's.

Correspondence ID: 7361 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: Niesman, Diane L

Received: May,07,2010 12:18:28

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Protect, protect, protect. That is the mission of the National Park Services. Do not allow exploitation or misuse of park land by off road vehicles or any other dangerous practice. Protect, protect, protect!!! Cape Hatteras and other protected lands depend on your agency.

Correspondence ID: 7362 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: Cote, Honorie

Received: May,07,2010 12:18:29

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of

the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7363 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:18:30
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please do not allow vehicular traffic on the beaches. To me the greatest joy of natural areas is to be able to see and hear them without the intrusion of man-made and mechanical devices. Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 7364 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: N/A, N/A
Received: May,07,2010 12:18:31
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: PLease help us to preserve our country's natural areas!

Correspondence ID: 7365 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7366 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: N/A, N/A
Received: May,07,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: In addition to the comments below, I'd like to add that one of the wonders of the National Park system is its peace and quiet. There is no good reason to ever open any of them up to off-road vehicles. There are plenty of other places people can ride these noise-makers without infringing on the rights of the rest of us to some quiet time. I find it very interesting that people want to go to these places and then destroy what makes them special.
Dear Superintendent Murray,
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7367 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:18:36
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft

plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
- 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7368 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: N/A, N/A
Received: May,07,2010 12:18:37
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please--- NO to ORV on these beaches

Correspondence ID: 7369 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: N/A, N/A
Received: May,07,2010 12:18:40
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: No off road vehicles.

Correspondence ID: 7370 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Smedira, Carrie F
Received: May,07,2010 12:18:43
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence:

I am writing against the idea of approving an Off Road Vehicle (ORV) management plan for Cape Hatteras National Seashore. I used to work as an Urban Park Ranger in Brooklyn, NY and was on Piping Plover detail for most of the summer. The protected beaches of Brooklynn included Canarsie Beach which was heavily used by ORV illegally. The water around the beach always had an oil & gas sheen on top and the beach itself was filthy from people eating and repairing their vehicles. The ORV users felt entitled to the area, which was so bizarre because they're from Brooklyn, the most densely populated NYC borough. We couldn't get rid of them because we didn't have the manpower to catch them. Canarsie Beach remains an eyesore to this day. North Carolina & the surrounding areas of Cape Hatteras aren't as populated as Brooklyn. Let the people go have their rides somewhere other than a beach - like their own backyard. I completely approve of emergency services using ORV to help park patrons requiring first aid. Other than that - North Carolina is a big place. Go use your ATV somewhere else.

Correspondence ID: 7371 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:18:46
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
- 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7372 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:18:46
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: This is Tom Finholt.
Please, help protect the precious and wonderful oceans that need so much protecting in this difficult time for the oceans and all people.
Thanks,
Tom Finholt

Correspondence ID: 7373 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Schollenberger, Craig R
Received: May,07,2010 12:18:57
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I urge you to adopt a modified Alternative D of the draft Environmental Impact Statement, protecting what makes Cape Hatteras so special--abundant (and endangered) wildlife and the natural quiet of miles of pristine Atlantic seashore.

Correspondence ID: 7374 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Fiorentino, Doris
Received: May,07,2010 12:18:59
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7375 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Paul, Mark D
Received: May,07,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.
***** Thank you very much for taking the time to protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again!
Sincerely,
Mark D. Paul

Correspondence ID: 7376 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:19:05
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7377 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore.
My husband and I visit the CHNS regularly and I treasure its wild feeling and the lack of development. The last thing I want to see there is turtles flattened by ORV's. The last thing I want to experience is air polluted by fumes from ORV's. I want a wild experience and I want to know the park's wildlife is safe today and for the future.
Of course the seashore isn't just important to me--it is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches.
All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7378 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: mcnamara, kevin m
Received: May,07,2010 12:19:12
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: my sister has a summer home neat Cape Hatteras that my wife and i visit during the summer and the beaches on the national seashore don't need to be ruined by loud dune buggies

Correspondence ID: 7379 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:19:13
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.
Sincerely,
Steve Olson

Correspondence ID: 7380 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:19:14
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
I am a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all

visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7381 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: N/A, N/A
Received: May,07,2010 12:19:14
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.
Thanks very much.

Correspondence ID: 7382 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Mandell-Rice, Bonnie S
Received: May,07,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
I am writing in regard to the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. As you know, the Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina, a spot where my family has held reunions many times. This area is cherished by us and countless other vacationers, bird watchers, and others who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, IF it is modified to include and recognize the following points.
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7383 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Larson, Pat
Received: May,07,2010 12:19:23
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please keep Off Road Vehicles off the Cape Hatteras Beaches. Save the beaches for peaceful walking and wildlife.

Correspondence ID: 7384 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:19:26
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: No vehicles on the beach except safety vehicles. Our beaches are not dumps.

Correspondence ID: 7385 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: laurie, annie
Received: May,07,2010 12:19:26
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
- 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7386 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Garrett, Sandra
Received: May,07,2010 12:19:29
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Off Road vehicles have no place in the Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

1) Damage to delicate ecosystems 2) Loss of income from people who do not want to spend time with the noise and other problems (safety, damage, pollution) caused by ORVs. 3) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." 3a) what part of "permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" is unclear?

Correspondence ID: 7387 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:19:30
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
- 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.
William Sanford

Correspondence ID: 7388 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore.
PLEASE DON'T LET OFF ROAD VEHICLES DOMINATE CAPE HATTERAS NATIONAL SEASHORE!Protect, cherish and preserve this rare undeveloped seashore.

We need to protect, cherish the remaining natural undeveloped seashores! The Cape Hatteras National Seashore is a significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
- 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing

an improved final ORV management plan.

Thank you for protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again!

Sincerely,

Terri Mungle Long time traveler, visitor and supporter of National Parks, Monuments, Wilderness areas.

Correspondence ID: 7389 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: Phillips, Richard J

Received: May.07,2010 12:19:34

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
- 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7390 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: Morocco, Carol

Received: May.07,2010 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
- 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

***** Thank you very much for taking the time to protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again!

Sincerely, Carol Morocco

Correspondence ID: 7391 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May.07,2010 12:19:36

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
- 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

0010954

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7392 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:19:39
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please protect Cape Hatteras as the important ecosystem and habitat to wildlife that it is. It isn't worth ruining the dunes and driving away the wildlife to entertain a few with ATV privileges.

Correspondence ID: 7393 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Wagner, Vickie M
Received: May,07,2010 12:19:40
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with sandy beaches, salt marshes and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7394 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: gilson, annette m
Received: May,07,2010 12:19:43
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: We have so few protected spaces left, and those that we do have left are under constant threat and stress. Please don't leave us with nothing.

Correspondence ID: 7395 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Aegerter, Bob
Received: May,07,2010 12:19:43
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7396 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:19:44
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am writing to ask that the off-road vehicle use for Cape Hatteras be minimized. The present proposal provides far too much for the use of ORVs at the expense of hikers and others trying to enjoy nature as it was intended.

Correspondence ID: 7397 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Kleindenst, Fred c
Received: May,07,2010 12:19:46
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Off road use by any motor vehicles is always destructive and needs to be prohibited.

Correspondence ID: 7398 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. Someone who is denied off-road access to this area will survive-squashed bird eggs and turtles won't!

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Thank you very much for taking the time to protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again!

Sincerely, Beverly Simone

Correspondence ID: 7399 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: kelley, jane E

Received: May,07,2010 12:19:50

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Ladies and Gentlemen:

Please do NOT allow Off Road Vehicles onto the precious Cape Hatteras National Seashore. This would be an unwise and dangerous move. The glory of our wildlife and the peace and quiet of walking tourists and visitors is at stake here. I can't imagine a more destructive way to manage the seashore than to allow motorized vehicles.

I am fully against this potential move to allow ORV.

Thanks for listening. There is no need for ORVs to be on this glorious piece of seashore.....not now and not ever.

Jane E. Kelley 66 Longmeadow Drive Amherst, MA 01002-3326

Correspondence ID: 7400 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 12:19:51

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

Correspondence ID: 7401 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 12:19:53

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Even though this does not seem like a fragile environment it is realitvely pristine. Traffic disturbs the terrain and the flora and fauna. It is my hope that people will have to work to get off the beaten path and not be dropped off by noisy, motorized means.

Correspondence ID: 7402 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 12:19:54

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7403 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: butenschoen, van w
Received: May,07,2010 12:19:55
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please leave the Cape Hatteras National Seashore to pedestrians; off-the- road vehicles do not belong! They are driven mostly by young, inconsiderate males who don't have to pay to fix the damage they cause.

Correspondence ID: 7404 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:20:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Although I now live on the West Coast, I have many friends in North Carolina and frequently visit the Outer Banks. Living close to a largely overdeveloped coastline, I appreciate all the more the unspoiled beauty of the National Seashore.
I am very troubled by the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement which privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.
Sincerely,
Robert T. McNamara

Correspondence ID: 7405 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:20:03
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7406 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: McGill, Ann C
Received: May,07,2010 12:20:05
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Off Road Vehicles damage the environment and the nesting areas that are used by shorebirds. They should not allowed in this area. Our environment is being destroyed by massive pollution, we should not knowingly destroy what nature cannot replace. To give pleasure for only a few should not be part of the Seashore which is to serve many as well as the wild inhabitants.

Correspondence ID: 7407 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:20:05
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Cape Hatteras Beaches should be kept free from vehicular traffic of any kind. It is to fragile and special to be spoiled by ORVs or vehicles of any kind. Please prevent this type of recreational use of this precious land.

Correspondence ID: 7408 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 12:20:16
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
 As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
- 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7409 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Dobbs, Michael
Received: May,07,2010 12:20:17
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
 As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
- 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7410 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Senour, Jon
Received: May,07,2010 12:20:24
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
 As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
- 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7411 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Batchelor, S
Received: May,07,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
 As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I am submitting comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource, cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches.

0010958

I am greatly concerned to see that all the alternatives in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. This unbalanced proposal fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant.

Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I do support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7412 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: Powers, Janet M

Received: May,07,2010 12:20:31

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Cape Hatteras is a fragile environment and will only suffer from the development of an off-road track. Those of us who appreciate the quiet, the birds and the unique environment there are horrified at the thought that the National Park Service would think of such an intrusion into the natural environment of this very special coastal area. Please do not risk the destruction of the areas set aside expressly as primitive wilderness. It's what we know and love about Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Please don't ruin in by letting in all sorts of motorized vehicles which will not only disturb the ecology of the area but also bring the wrong kinds of visitors to the lower part of seashore. As one who lives in a town that is invaded by motorcycles during the summer, I beg of you to let Cape Hatteras remain a pristine seashore environment.

Correspondence ID: 7413 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 12:20:36

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7414 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 12:20:36

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7415 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 12:20:37

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please, stop. Just stop with the wilderness trashing, the habitat destruction, the mass extinction of species. And what for? So a bunch of motorheads can drive offroad? Is there no end to the madness? I wish I could find another planet to live on. Seriously, this planet cannot support the sheer number of people living on it, much less the idiotic things they do endlessly in the name of greed and infantile, selfish entertainment. Just stop.

Correspondence ID: 7416 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Kellogg, Caroline
Received: May,07,2010 12:20:39
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
 As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.
 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."
 Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7417 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:20:41
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Off road vehicles in such a fragile ecology is not the best use for lands held for everyone. While I agree that for the most part we should be allowed to use public lands as we wish we must always weigh the impact of what we do. This impact is to costly in this environment. Sincerely Chris Hill

Correspondence ID: 7418 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:20:41
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: The Cape Hatteras area should be kept as pristine as possible. Commercialiaztion will endanger all wildlife there.

Correspondence ID: 7419 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:20:47
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, and as one who has had the pleasure to visit and enjoy the wonder of the Cape Hatteras area, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore.
 The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.
 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."
 Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7420 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
 I grew up in Virginia in a family that camped on the Outer Banks. As a Girl Scout I also spent many weekends there and after I was married, while living in North Carolina and elsewhere, my husband and I loved to vacation there. As campers and pedestrians we support the NPCA and their efforts to keep this beautiful area as natural as possible.
 As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement

privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7421 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:20:50
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please prohibit ORV use at Cape Hatteras.

Correspondence ID: 7422 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,

I am from Bainbridge Island, WA and believe we must preserve and protect our National parks and wilderness areas.

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

I have been on many areas of the WA and OR coast that are not in the national park system and allow ORVs as well as cars on the beach. This is disturbing to the people who visit there as well as any sea life on the shore. I also think it is dangerous to allow motor vehicles where people, especially children, walk and play. I would hate to see this happen at Cape Hatteras.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7423 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: robey, valerie
Received: May,07,2010 12:20:55
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: DONT!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

Correspondence ID: 7424 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:20:57
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please do not let off-road vehicles on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. This would be a serious mistake.

As a Floridian, I know personally how vehicle traffic, including off-road vehicles, affect those places we turn to for the kind of recreation only nature can provide, and vehicles of any kind detract significantly from that recreational experience. Off-road vehicles have more than enough places where their presence is not detrimental to everyone else's experience.

As a part-time North Carolinian and someone who has spent time at CHNS, I cringe at the idea of off-road vehicles despoiling that wonderful bit of our natural world.

Correspondence ID: 7425 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Peterson, Susan
Received: May,07,2010 12:21:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Again, I appreciate the opportunity to give my input, and hope that our future generations will have the same opportunity to enjoy these areas that are protected for ALL OF US without undue favoritism shown to those who like to play on ORV being allowed to trump the interests of the MAJORITY of Americans, present & future. Thank You.

Correspondence ID: 7426 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Long Crow, Kelly D
Received: May,07,2010 12:21:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.
Sincerely, Kelly D Long Crow

Correspondence ID: 7427 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Schunck , Tobias P
Received: May,07,2010 12:21:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please reduce and limit ORV usage. ORVs are highly destructive to the environment. They will destroy the fragile dunes and increase erosion. Everyone else will have to listen to their noise, smell their exhaust and pick up the trash they leave behind. Just look at what happens in the West when ORV's are left to destroy our great natural heritage.
With best wishes from Colorado,
Tobias Schunck

Correspondence ID: 7428 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:21:04
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Off-Road Vehicles are an abomination in our national parks. They are noisy and polluting and degrade the physical environment, frighten the wildlife, can endanger humans, and have no place in a nature reserve that should provide people with the opportunity to be closer to their natural environment, undisturbed by loud man-made noise and pollution.
I strongly urge that the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Management Plan set a goal of phasing out all ORVs within the borders of the Park.

Correspondence ID: 7429 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Saulter, A
Received: May,07,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the beauty: wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Cape Hatteras and the Outer Banks of North Carolina, have consistently made the top 10 list of Best Beaches in the USA. The criteria for making this list, includes water and sand quality as well as safety, facilities and environmental management. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID:	7430	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,07,2010 12:21:10						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	An Off Road Vehicle (ORV) management plan for Cape Hatteras National Seashore is being considered by the the National Park Service, It should approve a plan that places greater emphasis on pedestrian access than vehicle access to protect wildlife such as endangered sea turtles and shorebirds.						
Correspondence ID:	7431	Project:	10641	Document:	32596		
Name:	Miller, Jayme S						
Received:	May,07,2010 00:00:00						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	<p>Dear Superintendent Murray,</p> <p>As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.</p> <p>1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."</p> <p>2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.</p> <p>3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.</p> <p>***** Thank you very much for taking the time to protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again!</p> <p>Sincerely, Jayme S. P. Miller</p>						
Correspondence ID:	7432	Project:	10641	Document:	32596		
Name:	LEALI, ROBERT P						
Received:	May,07,2010 12:21:16						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	SAVE ALL THAT WE CAN - WE ALREADY LOOSE TO OUR OUR CURRENT AND PAST ECOLOGICAL MISTAKES.						
Correspondence ID:	7433	Project:	10641	Document:	32596		
Name:	Orlinski, Patricia						
Received:	May,07,2010 12:21:19						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	I visited Cape Hatteras last summer and would hate to see it cluttered with all kinds of vehicles. The area is too beautiful to clutter it. More natural ways of visiting there seem more appropriate.						
Correspondence ID:	7434	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,07,2010 12:21:20						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	<p>Dear Superintendent Murray,</p> <p>As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.</p> <p>1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."</p> <p>2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.</p> <p>3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Mary Darling, PhD</p>						

Correspondence ID: 7435 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Kennedy, Arthur
Received: May,07,2010 12:21:22
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Birds and other beach creatures don't burn petrochemicals. I prefer limiting the polluting ORV range of destruction.

Correspondence ID: 7436 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.
I have lived in North Carolina and I have enjoyed the beauty of Cape Hatteras. Please limit the amount of environmental terrorism we humans may perpetrate upon nature and our fellow humans who would also enjoy this awesome place on the planet.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.
Sincerely, Helen Baumgartner

Correspondence ID: 7437 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Link, John J
Received: May,07,2010 12:21:23
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7438 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:21:31
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I urge you to put strong regulations in place to control ORV use.
The ORV users were one of the active groups who stopped what is now Big Cypress from becoming the Miami-Dade airport.
However, although the organized groups are careful, individuals have caused so much damage in areas of Big Cypress that they have had to be closed to ORV use.
Without effective and enforced regulations, the beach areas will be destroyed, along with nesting areas and the ability to walk and enjoy the beach.

Correspondence ID: 7439 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Stitt, Bryan J
Received: May,07,2010 12:21:34
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: By no means should we allow vehicles to drive along the beaches in a public parks!!!
Much of our coast lines are destroyed as it is....we can't be adding to the destruction.
We don't need another Daytona Beach, FL!!!

Correspondence ID: 7440 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: Webb, Terry L
Received: May,07,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence:

Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

***** Thank you very much for taking the time to protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again!

Sincerely,

Terry and Clayton Webb

Correspondence ID: 7441 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Cheeseman, Ted
Received: May,07,2010 12:21:37
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence:

Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7442 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:21:40
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence:

Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7443 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Cypherd, Victoria A
Received: May,07,2010 12:21:48

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: There are plenty of places for ORV owners to recreate but there are only limited protected nature areas. Please keep this pristine area ORV free to protect the endangered sea turtles and shorebirds.

Correspondence ID: 7444 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: N/A, N/A

Received: May.07,2010 12:21:51

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7445 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May.07,2010 12:21:52

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7446 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May.07,2010 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

***** Thank you very much for taking the time to protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again!

Sincerely,

Correspondence ID: 7447 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Peloquen MD, James L
Received: May,07,2010 12:21:55
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Protect Cape Hatteras National Park from ORV!!!!

Correspondence ID: 7448 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Lapointe, Eric
Received: May,07,2010 12:21:56
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7449 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. This approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7450 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Raper, Connie K
Received: May,07,2010 12:22:03
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7451 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: Deal, John R
Received: May,07,2010 12:22:05
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
 As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.
 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."
 Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7452 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Fay, Robert H
Received: May,07,2010 12:22:10
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
 As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.
 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."
 Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7453 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:22:11
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please keep off road vehicles off on Cape Hatteras

Correspondence ID: 7454 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Modisette, Holly A
Received: May,07,2010 12:22:15
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
 As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.
 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."
 Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7455 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: Bell, Denise C
Received: May,07,2010 12:22:16
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
 As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.
 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."
 Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.
 Sincerely,
 Denise Bell

Correspondence ID: 7456 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:22:18
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
 As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.
 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."
 Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7457 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Miles, Margaret s
Received: May,07,2010 12:22:19
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please keep our beautiful pristine shores without cars that destroy our beaches, wildlife, and plants and create noise pollution. We already have to be careful with our children on the beaches of Cape Carteret due to car traffic on the beach. Some of the drivers are teens and young adults who try to drive as fast as they can in the sand. It is beyond a nuisance.
 Margaret S. Miles

Correspondence ID: 7458 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Elliott, Lynn M
Received: May,07,2010 12:22:21
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.
 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."
 Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7459 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Schmitz, Mary Jude F
Received: May,07,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,

Last year my family and I visited Cape Hatteras in late June. We stayed in Hatteras Village and had a fantastic time. We so enjoyed all the beautiful wildlife, the peaceful ocean, and the fantastic sunsets over the sound. We love the less "touristy" locations and Cape Hatteras was the perfect beach for us.

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7460 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Pehme, Kalev
Received: May,07,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

***** Thank you very much for taking the time to protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again!

Best regards,
Kalev Pehme

Correspondence ID: 7461 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Koloze, Kathy
Received: May,07,2010 12:22:36
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please don't give the beaches over to motor vehicles. Beaufort and Bellhaven are home to friends and the destruction of Cape Hatteras needs slowed, not accelerated.

Correspondence ID: 7462 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Swem, Virginia L
Received: May,07,2010 12:22:38
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: To Whom it May Concern:

Please do not allow off road vehicles on Cape Hatteras beaches! There are so few pristine beaches of beauty for people to walk. There are so few havens for wildlife left.

Cape Hatteras is one of my favorite places in the entire world (and I have travelled a great deal). What I love about it is the naturalness of it - the fact that I can walk and walk and just be in nature without vehicles. This is a precious place and you have the power to keep it that way.

My father spent most of his career working for the National Park Service. He ended his career as an Assistant Director of the National Park Service. He is the one who brought us to Cape Hatteras when I was a child. He would be greatly saddened to see a change such as this instigated at Cape Hatteras.

Please consider the ramifications of your actions. If we don't protect our lands and seashores, who will?

Thank you,
Virginia Swem

Correspondence ID: 7463 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:22:44
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please stop recreational vehicles from using beautiful beaches for their joy rides.Red-necks have absolutely no consideration fro others with their rude behavior.Kick them out!

Correspondence ID: 7464 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.
***** Thank you very much for taking the time to protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again!
Sincerely,

Correspondence ID: 7465 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Jones-Umberger, Stanley
Received: May,07,2010 12:22:47
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Do not cater to the mindless ORV crowd who know nothing and care nothing about the wildlife that depend on this beach. You KNOW that a natural or man-made disaster will harm this habitat eventually, so don't add to the pressure.

Correspondence ID: 7466 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:22:48
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7467 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Banik, Lisa
Received: May,07,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan, which would protect the wonderful wildlife and habitat that makes Cape Hatteras National Seashore so special!

***** Thank you very much for taking the time to protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again!

Sincerely,
Lisa M. Banik

Correspondence ID: 7468 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Rogers, Connie
Received: May,07,2010 12:22:51
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I do not believe that Off Road Vehicles should be allowed in sensitive beach areas. They will disturb the natural ecological balance and furthermore be noisy, disturbing the other users who are on foot.

Correspondence ID: 7469 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: N/A, N/A
Received: May,07,2010 12:22:52
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please keep off the road vehicles off the our national seashore. They are disruptive and destructive.

Correspondence ID: 7470 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: N/A, Laura
Received: May,07,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina.
I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.
Just because I used most of a pre-written letter does not diminish the strength of my opinion on this matter.
Again, thank you for your time, Laura

Correspondence ID: 7471 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:22:55
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please do not let off-road vehicles dominate the Hatteras shore.

Correspondence ID: 7472 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:22:56
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please adopt a modified Alternative D of the draft Environmental Impact Statement to protect Cape Hatteras and it's wildlife.
ORV traffic damages the environment and makes an incredible amount of noise. Why should these users be able to negatively impact the use of every other citizen wishing to enjoy the peaceful and scenic beauty of the area?
Pedestrians were here and supporting this area long before ORV use became so prevalent.

Correspondence ID: 7473 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Franchi, Irena
Received: May,07,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that

make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

***** Thank you very much for taking the time to protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again!

Sincerely

Correspondence ID: 7474 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:22:59
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.
Russell Brown

Correspondence ID: 7475 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: crampton, vicky
Received: May,07,2010 12:23:04
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Offroad vehicles should not be allowed on the Cape Hatteras Seashore. They are polluting and noisy and ruin the experience of the visitors.

Correspondence ID: 7476 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:23:10
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I oppose Off-Road Vehicles in our parks. They are a noise disturbance to other park users not to mention a major nuisance to the wildlife. A park is supposed to be about conservation and preservation. Not about dirty gas fuelled vehicles trashing the pristine coastland. The noise alone is the biggest reason not allow them in the park. The damage to the ecosystem is also a major factor. Please do not allow Off-road vehicles in the park.

Correspondence ID: 7477 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Klucsor, Carmen A
Received: May,07,2010 12:23:16
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: As an American who enjoys the outdoors at national parks through day trips and extended camping, I strongly urge you to keep these areas as beautiful and peaceful as possible. I strongly urge you not to let off road vehicles dominate Cape Hatteras National Seashore!
Please do not approve an Off Road Vehicle (ORV) management plan for Cape Hatteras National Seashore that will disproportionately dedicate beach use to year-round ORV traffic at the expense of wildlife and pedestrian visitors.
Please do approve an ORV management plan that places greater emphasis on pedestrian access and wildlife management, especially with regard to endangered sea turtles and shorebirds.
Sincerely,
Carmen A. Klucsor Sunnyvale, CA 94086

Correspondence ID: 7478 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Gobely, Michelle
Received: May,07,2010 12:23:25
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird

watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7479 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: Stehlin, Sandra R

Received: May,07,2010 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

Other National Parks do not allow ORV use by visitors. I can't imagine seeing uncontrolled quad runners dashing across sacred Battlefields or zipping along the Santa Fe trail that is protected as a National Monument. There are SO MANY other places for people to run these noisy, polluting machines...Cape Hatteras is definitely NOT one of the places where this is appropriate!!!

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, NOT ORV USE. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7480 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: Robinson, Paul

Received: May,07,2010 12:23:29

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Keep those beautiful beaches safe and clean!

Correspondence ID: 7481 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: riger, richard

Received: May,07,2010 12:23:31

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please do NOT allow orvs to ruin a public beach, shame on you even thinking about it. Are you not aware of the current beach erosion problems that are already going on around the country ? Think again boys and girls.

Correspondence ID: 7482 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: Desmond, Angela M

Received: May,07,2010 12:23:35

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best

examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID:	7483	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,07,2010 00:00:00						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	<p>Dear Superintendent Murray,</p> <p>As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. As a person who likes to travel, camp, hike and bird, and is concerned about the environment, I wish national park areas to be kept as natural as possible. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.</p> <p>1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."</p> <p>2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.</p> <p>3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan. ***** Thank you very much for taking the time to protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again!</p> <p>Sincerely,</p>						
Correspondence ID:	7484	Project:	10641	Document:	32596		
Name:	N/A, N/A						
Received:	May,07,2010 12:23:42						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	<p>The beaches at Cape Hatteras NC are beautiful. My husband and I return every year to enjoy all aspects of these pristine beaches. So far, the balance between relaxing, fishing and vehicles on the beaches are fairly well balanced. Changing the balance will make what most people enjoy disappear from their Cape Hatteras experience and will drive many more people away than allowing more off-road vehicles will attract. In addition to the human element on the beaches, there is also the wildlife that must be considered. Cape Hatteras is an important spot on the migration flight paths of many birds. Increased off-road vehicles will unfortunately destroy habitat and result in decreased wildlife population. I also have a personal concern with the dunes. These are so fragile that it would take very little to destroy the dunes and therefore the island itself.</p> <p>We are members of the National Parks Conservation Association and support America's national parks. We have always been proud of what our national parks have accomplished and the goals that were set to preserve our unique parks. Please reconsider your decision to increase off road vehicle traffic in this truly beautiful spot.</p>						
Correspondence ID:	7485	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,07,2010 12:23:46						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	<p>Cape Hatteras National Seashore is for the use and enjoyment of ALL Americans, not just off road vehicle users. When I go to the beach, I want to see and hear the surf and wildlife, not dodge off road vehicles and listen to them roar across the sand. I want to smell the fresh sea air, not exhaust fumes. None of these things matter to off road vehicle drivers, so let them drive their vehicles somewhere else -- somewhere those of us who want to enjoy the seashore as it don't have to see, hear, or smell them. If off road vehicles are allowed at Cape Hatteras, I will no longer have any desire to visit... or support the Park Service.</p>						
Correspondence ID:	7486	Project:	10641	Document:	32596		
Name:	N/A, N/A						
Received:	May,07,2010 12:23:48						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	<p>Off road vehicles do not belong in a national seashore. They are better suited to county beaches where a portion of the beach is available for this type of recreation. It is willful negligence to allow ORV to race in fragile ecosystems with sealife and seabirds trying to build nests in the sand. This is idiotic and wasteful of our precious animal life.</p>						
Correspondence ID:	7487	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,07,2010 12:23:51						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	<p>Please carefully consider the harmful effects that such vehicles can have on these precious dunes.</p>						
Correspondence ID:	7488	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,07,2010 00:00:00						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	<p>Dear Superintendent Murray,</p> <p>As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that</p>						

make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
- 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Correspondence ID: 7489 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May.07,2010 12:23:55
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Commissioner Murray:

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association, a supporter of national parks, and a taxpayer, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off-Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is highly sought by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
- 3) The final Plan must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7490 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Tomashevsky, Robert
Received: May.07,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
- 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

***** Thank you very much for taking the time to protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again!

Correspondence ID: 7491 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Gault, Carol A
Received: May.07,2010 12:24:05
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

4) Pismo Beach in California is trashed because of ORV's, don't let it happen to Cape Hatteras

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7492 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Wilke, Cathy L
Received: May,07,2010 12:24:13
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Keep the "wild" places wild - from all motorized vehicles.

Correspondence ID: 7493 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Warner, Christopher M
Received: May,07,2010 12:24:14
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: When Cape Hatteras National Seashore was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."
Off-road vehicles are antithetical to the preservation of "primitive wilderness." ORV enthusiasts have ample areas open for the enjoyment of their hobby. The dwindling number of wild places in America need to be preserved for the benefit of wildlife and the ecosystems in which they live and for low-impact recreation.
Thank you for your consideration,
Chris Warner

Correspondence ID: 7494 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Mason, Lynelle
Received: May,07,2010 12:24:15
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: As a writer who is very interested in lighthouses, I urge you take whatever action is necessary to protect Cape Hatteras.
Sincerely,
Lynelle Mason

Correspondence ID: 7495 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:24:17
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Why is it that those with motorized vehicles feel they have the right to invade every sanctuary of the natural world? Why cannot beaches and forests and other areas remain unspoiled and available only to foot traffic? Please do not grant motorized vehicles any access to areas where they have previously not been allowed, leave the people to enjoy what parts of their world they can while not being interrupted by some other inconsiderate person's noise and pollution. Please. Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 7496 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Walker, Carol I
Received: May,07,2010 12:24:20
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: It is crucial to the health of our world that we preserve all the turtles and shore birds possible. One of many big problems with the health of our oceans is the burgeoning jellyfish over abundance which interfere with the breeding cycle of many of our native species of fish. We know we need to feed people as well as keep our fisherman able to sustain their livelihood. We have to have a healthy balance in sea life for the healthy environment -for the very health of all of us. Turtles are endangered and so are many kinds of shore birds. The gulf coast disaster is going to bring a huge loss of life currently to breeding sea turtles and certainly will affect shore birds because of the enormous oil spill closing in on Louisiana's shore line even if the capping off that's being worked on does work because the amount of oil is such an extremely large amount! This is serious business -we all want to have healthy food to eat and environments that will sustain us, not harm us all!

Correspondence ID: 7497 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Brangan, Sarah
Received: May,07,2010 12:24:21
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and

analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

I do not feel that ORV belong in protected areas like these. There is plenty of other land for these vehicles. Please work to help the National Parks remain the last outposts of wilderness that we have in our busy urban society. Thank you!!

Correspondence ID:	7498	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	
Name:	Loeb, Rema					
Received:	May,07,2010 12:24:23					
Correspondence Type:	Web Form					
Correspondence:	Is there no place that you will protect and keep sacred? Why are you allowing the selfish people who are burning hydrocarbons to ruin OUR national parks? You folks allow logging, gas drilling, and now destructive recreation that you know very well to be disruptive, if not deadly, to many species. We need places to escape from the areas where we live and work, many of which are industrial disasters. You are supposed to protect OUR parks, not only for us but for the children and grandchildren to come. If the native people of this land had been such horrible stewards, there would be no wild places. I guess there would also be no gas, oil, coal, trees, clean waterways for this generation to exploit. This isn't rocket science. If someone paves over half of your backyard and now wants the rest for riding four wheelers, are you going to let them take the little remaining lawn, trees, and garden? Where is your conscience? Where, indeed, is your common sense?					
Correspondence ID:	7499	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	
Name:	Weyand, Mike					
Received:	May,07,2010 12:24:24					
Correspondence Type:	Web Form					
Correspondence:	Ban all off-road vehicles on the beach/dunes as they destroy the environment. Thank you!					
Correspondence ID:	7500	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	
Name:	N/A, N/A					
Received:	May,07,2010 00:00:00					
Correspondence Type:	Web Form					
Correspondence:	Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan. As an ORV user, I believe the most beautiful and cherished regions should be kept pristine by allowing only low-impact groups to access specific areas. With that said, there ought to be ample areas for all well-represented groups to find their recreational outflow.					
Correspondence ID:	7501	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private: Y
Name:	private					
Received:	May,07,2010 12:24:26					
Correspondence Type:	Web Form					
Correspondence:	Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.					
Correspondence ID:	7502	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private: Y
Name:	private					
Received:	May,07,2010 12:24:28					

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence:

Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7503 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: Watson, Jim

Received: May,07,2010 12:24:42

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Vehicles at Cape Hatteras

A little of basic coastal Geology. You can drive a bulldozer on the beach between tide lines and nothing will happen. But have a person walking on the dunes and a huge blowout can occur. This is pretty simple. Allow vehicles on the beach with huge fines for anyone crossing or in the dunes. This is a National Seashore, lets protect it for the citizens and not let a few ruin it. Thanks, Jim Watson

Correspondence ID: 7504 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 12:24:42

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7505 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: Kokoris, Moki

Received: May,07,2010 12:24:44

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Respectfully, Moki Kokoris

Correspondence ID:	7506	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,07,2010 12:24:45						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	<p>Dear Superintendent Murray,</p> <p>As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.</p> <p>1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."</p> <p>2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.</p> <p>3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.</p>						
Correspondence ID:	7507	Project:	10641	Document:	32596		
Name:	N/A, N/A						
Received:	May,07,2010 12:24:47						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	<p>I respectfully request that you deep-6 the plan to allow off-road vehicles on Cape Hatteras' beach. Beaches are ecologically important areas and are undeserving of the noise and intrusion that is inherently part of off-roading. At this most ecologically important and fragile time, this nation should not be considering ANYTHING that would compromise the fragility of our shores. The massive BP oil spill in the Gulf of Mexico is expected to move round the Florida Keys and as far up as the North Carolina and Virginia shorelines, possibly further. We are in uncharted territory here. NO OFF-ROAD VEHICLES!!!</p>						
Correspondence ID:	7508	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,07,2010 00:00:00						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	<p>Dear Superintendent Murray,</p> <p>As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.</p> <p>1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."</p> <p>2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.</p> <p>3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.</p> <p>I have just spent two weeks of my life (and thousands of dollars) working as volunteer for Leatherback sea turtle conservation in Trinidad. These creatures, of ancient lineage, were truly amazing to be around. We need to protect their habitat and legacy. Understanding of and respect for the natural world help to conserve our humanity and our ability to show compassion to one another as well as all the earth. When will humans learn to delay the immediate gratification of the self and learn to appreciate the larger universe?</p> <p>Please, take the time to fully and actually protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore. Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today.</p> <p>Sincerely, Joanna L. Challacombe</p>						
Correspondence ID:	7509	Project:	10641	Document:	32596		
Name:	Weeks, Mandy A						
Received:	May,07,2010 12:24:56						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	Please no vehicles or off-road vehicles at the Cape!						
Correspondence ID:	7510	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,07,2010 12:25:01						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft						

plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
- 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

***** Thank you very much for taking the time to protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 7511 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: DiPasquale, Denise M

Received: May,07,2010 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

As a beach resident, I appreciate the beauty of our coastlines and urge you to make every effort to preserve and protect them.

The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors.

Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
- 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7512 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 12:25:11

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
- 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

- Jenna Garvey Gilbertville, MA

Correspondence ID: 7513 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: Caldwell, James

Received: May,07,2010 12:25:13

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird

watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7514 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Doner, John P
Received: May,07,2010 12:25:20
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7515 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Frohn, Joyce
Received: May,07,2010 12:25:29
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: We need places in our world that are quiet, clean and peaceful. That does not combine with racing motor vehicles.

Correspondence ID: 7516 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: N/A, N/A
Received: May,07,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

***** Thank you very much for taking the time to protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again!

Sincerely,
W Jansen

Correspondence ID: 7517 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:25:35
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence:

Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Sincerely,
Carol

Correspondence ID: 7518 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:25:35
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I would prefer NOT to see off road vehicles allowed. However, I would not want the exemption applied to bicycles. Human powered "vehicles" should be okay.

Correspondence ID: 7519 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:25:36
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please keep our crystal coast pristine and healthy. Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 7520 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:25:47
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Allowing off-road vehicles to dominate a fragile beach such as that of Cape Hatteras is, in every way, a very bad idea. Thanks!

Correspondence ID: 7521 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: N/A, N/A
Received: May,07,2010 12:25:52
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7522 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Williams, Charlie
Received: May,07,2010 12:26:04
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: We should not allow off road trucks vehicles on this treasurer.

Correspondence ID: 7523 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:26:09
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: The National Park Service (NPS) NOT TO approve the Off Road Vehicle (ORV) management plan for Cape Hatteras National Seashore that will disproportionately dedicate beach use to year-round ORV traffic at the expense of wildlife and pedestrian visitors.
Please do not approve this! My comments are we have a responsibility to preserve wildlife for future generations to enjoy. For my daughter and future

grandchildren have the same right we have to enjoy wildlife. If we continue to destroy what will be left for future generations, this is the ethical, moral and responsible thing to do, there are plenty of places to enjoy off road vehicles, places what do not distress wild life. In Homestead, FL they have a race track, and large parking lot unused baseball park.

My final words are please lets all do the responsible and ethical, and moral thing, not only for our children, but also for wildlife that we so enjoy when we are enjoying nature. Sincerely Julia L. Lemus

Correspondence ID:	7524	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,07,2010 12:26:09						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	<p>Dear Superintendent Murray,</p> <p>The Cape Hatteras National Seashore is no place for off road vehicles!</p> <p>As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.</p> <p>1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."</p> <p>2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."</p> <p>Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.</p> <p>3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.</p>						
Correspondence ID:	7525	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,07,2010 00:00:00						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	<p>Dear Superintendent Murray,</p> <p>I am a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, and I thank you for allowing me to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.</p> <p>1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." cur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.</p> <p>2) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.</p> <p>Thank you for considering these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.</p> <p>***** Thank you very much for taking the time to protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again!</p> <p>Sincerely,</p>						
Correspondence ID:	7526	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,07,2010 12:26:26						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	<p>I believe that allowing more off road vehicle use at Cape Hatteras will enefit a few and endanger a great many more, both human and animal. In addition to noise there is the danger to animals, land, sea, and air from being run over. Turtle and bird nests could well be destroyed and young crushed. Off road vehicle use needs to be curtailed as much as possible to benefit the majority, both today and in the future.</p>						
Correspondence ID:	7527	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,07,2010 12:26:28						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	<p>There are enough places for off road vehicles to go to now. Why are you trying to spoil quiet, delicate places with loud noise, fumes and damage to the environment?</p>						
Correspondence ID:	7528	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	Dodd, Gordon						
Received:	May,07,2010 12:26:30						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	<p>Any off road vehicles use will ruin the prestine beauty of the land as well pollute the ground and the water, please enforce any measures that are deemed necessary to insre the land stays beautiful</p>						
Correspondence ID:	7529	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y

Name: private
Received: May.07,2010 12:26:32
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
 I am very disappointed with the draft plan to manage ORV use in the Hatteras National Seashore. As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.
 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."
 Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.
 Thank you,
 Allison Wright

Correspondence ID: 7530 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May.07,2010 12:26:34
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: DONT LET OFF ROAD VEHICLES DOMINATE CAPE HATTERAS NATIONAL SEASHORE!
 The National Park Service (NPS) is on the verge of approving an Off Road Vehicle (ORV) management plan for Cape Hatteras National Seashore that will disproportionately dedicate beach use to year-round ORV traffic at the expense of wildlife and pedestrian visitors.
 We only have a few days left to stop this from happening! The public comment period will close on May 11 and if national park advocates--like you--fail to take action, Cape Hatteras National Seashore will be dominated by ORV use for the next 20 years!
 NPCA seeks an ORV management plan that places greater emphasis on pedestrian access and wildlife management, especially with regard to endangered sea turtles and shorebirds.

Correspondence ID: 7531 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May.07,2010 12:26:34
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Pedestrian (people walking - good for a healthy lifestyle) and wildlife (who have no place else to go) should be the major activity on any beach. ORV use by humans, other than rescue crews have no place on a beach. let's keep humanity active, reducing stress (unless one gets run over by an ORV) and eating right is a major item on washington's agenda. turtles hatching, stand NO chance against ORVs. they do NOT belong on the cape's beaches.

Correspondence ID: 7532 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May.07,2010 12:26:41
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
 As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.
 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."
 Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7533 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Knott, Thomas
Received: May.07,2010 12:26:41
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please BAN off road vehicles from being operated in the Cape Hatteras Seashore Beaches!

Correspondence ID: 7534 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 12:26:45

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I have owned a home in Hatteras for the last 10 years. I derive income from this house as a rental property when we are not there. If there is a "significant" cut back on the pedestrian/ORV/pet access to beach areas, then there will be a significant negative financial impact to this area because that is what visitors COME to Hatteras to do--use the beaches to the fullest. Clearly, endangered species--unique to the OBX beach area--need to be protected. If the scientific/environmental community comes up with CONCLUSIVE evidence that major restrictions are warranted to protect those species, then those restrictions should be implemented. However, I would be CERTAIN that the scientific evidence is CONCLUSIVE as to the level of beach restrictions. If there is ANY uncertainty, then I would request more minimum restrictions than maximum. Certain aspects of an area ARE what an area is all about. If you go to a mountain, you expect to climb. If you go to a forest, you expect to walk through trails. If you go to the ocean, you expect access to that water. THAT is what Hatteras is--a beach surrounded by water and a strip of land. Recommendation: Start with minimum restrictions and you can always make them more expansive. See if the endangered species co-exist with the population. Start with major restrictions and you will gut the area from a financial standpoint, take away the essence of what makes OBX "special" and , possibly NOT have any major impact on the endangered species. Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 7535 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 12:26:46

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: To allow the use of Cape Hatteras for off road vehicles is as irresponsible as BP not installing safety measures on their oil rigs, the beaches are for everyone and allowing ORV's will seriously impact the environment for the "fun" of a few. Our planet is struggling to survive us as it is, we are the stewards of this world and we must act responsibly to care for our environment and allowing oil burning vehicles onto beaches and parks is not the way to be responsible.

Correspondence ID: 7536 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: N/A, Robert

Received: May,07,2010 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
- 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

***** Thank you very much for taking the time to protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again!

Sincerely,

Correspondence ID: 7537 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
- 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

In closing, Cape Hatteras has always been one of my favorite national parks. The beauty, the peace and quiet along a lesser used piece of beach, and most of all watching and enjoying the pelicans and other wildlife. Please protect our park for all to enjoy and continue to preserve this natural area above all else.

Sincerely, Carol J Bochert

Correspondence ID: 7538 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:26:52
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: ORVs have got to be restricted on national park lands. Even if these enthusiasts say they are just having fun, these vehicles tear up the landscape and pollute our land air and water. They should only be used at specially designed areas with blocks for their noise. Please do not allow them into national or state park areas

Correspondence ID: 7539 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: Hunt, Jill B
Received: May,07,2010 12:26:55
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: The North Carolina coast is so special, it should be preserved as much as it can be. "Freedom!!"s just fantastic, really, but when it comes to wasteful recreation trashing what's left of our beautiful places then that's just a shame on our species. Please do everything you can to keep the NC coast beautiful, and safe for all the plants and animals who live there.

Correspondence ID: 7540 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.
***** Thank you very much for taking the time to protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again!

Correspondence ID: 7541 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:27:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7542 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: Doak, Hartson
Received: May,07,2010 12:27:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As a tour guide for Kauai ATV, I would take tourists on well defined trails to see the back country of Kauai. The key words are well refined trails. This keeps the ATVs from going into critical habitat areas but allows for the education to the public of the needs of the habitat. Hawaii has the highest percentage of endangered or lost species in the US. With these well defined paths to travelin, the endangered plants and animals are protected. Both the environment and the ATVers can get what they want.

Correspondence ID: 7543 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: Smith, Steve
Received: May,07,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence:

Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

***** Thank you very much for taking the time to protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again!

Sincerely,

Steve

Correspondence ID: 7544 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:27:08
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7545 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: none.

Correspondence ID: 7546 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:27:15
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: We should be doing everything possible to save the environment.

Correspondence ID: 7547 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:27:15
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the

pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7548 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Van Praag, Jane L.
Received: May,07,2010 12:27:24
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7549 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:27:25
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.
I appreciate the opportunity to provide these comments. Thank you for the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.
Please send any return correspondence via email. Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 7550 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Pacey-Field, Susan L.
Received: May,07,2010 12:27:28
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Off road vehicles have no place on a seashore. It causes erosion.

Correspondence ID: 7551 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: N/A, N/A
Received: May,07,2010 12:27:33
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
Enough said.

Correspondence ID: 7552 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Roe, Christina
Received: May,07,2010 12:27:36
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I find it incredible that a plan favoring a special interest group is even being considered. The people who operate such vehicles are reckless, entirely self-centered and do not care about the environment or the rights of other citizens to enjoy the area in peace.

Correspondence ID: 7553 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Rea, Michael
Received: May,07,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
 As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.
 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7554 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Bundy, Jennifer
Received: May,07,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
 Yes, this is a form letter suggested by the NPCA. I'm using it because it has all the important information. But I'm not just mindlessly forwarding this to you. I'm dismayed that such a small but vocal group of ORV enthusiasts could take precedence over the overwhelming majority of people who wish to enjoy this area for its peace and beauty -- not to mention our species' responsibility for the welfare of other species. As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.
 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7555 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Schreier, Marguerite C
Received: May,07,2010 12:27:53
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please don't ruin what makes the Outer Banks so special. Our environment is so precious and so fragile. We have to protect it for future generations. The beaches weren't made for constant abuse by vehicles. Why do you have to have it all?
 Margie Schreier

Correspondence ID: 7556 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Jones, Jay
Received: May,07,2010 12:27:55
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I have had the rare privilege of seeing the impact of humans in many places around the globe as well as the opportunity to view environmental issues from many perspectives, including oil and gas exploration. My background also included work as a summer seasonal at Gulf Islands NS. This experience provided a glimpse of the multiple use forces at play in the NPS, and the ecology of areas such as the Cape Hatteras NS. My considered opinion is that we cannot afford to allocate space in the limited confines of Cape Hatteras NS for this activity. If there is a venue for ORV, let it be built inland on less sensitive land and run by commercial enterprises. Stewardship suggests that ORV activities must be assigned a very low priority in any NPS entity and certainly not in this area that is already so heavily impacted. To accommodating this activity will only serve to perpetuate this high impact practice.
 I would be delighted to talk further about this issue. My contact information is below. Thank you for your consideration.
 Jay Jones Professor of Biology and Biochemistry University of La Verne La Verne, CA 91750 jjones@laverne.edu

Correspondence ID: 7557 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Samp, Cecelia
Received: May,07,2010 12:27:56
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
- 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7558 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Martin, Ben
Received: May,07,2010 12:27:56
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: My family has been going to the outer banks for over 20 years and while it's natural appeal still shines, too much of the land has been developed for commercial and rental development. Even more disturbing has been the decline of the natural fauna due to habitat loss and vehicle use in the still wild areas. The more motorized vehicles are allowed to penetrate the preserved areas, the more the wildlife is disturbed and damaged. These areas need to be restricted to pedestrian access only in order to preserve the wildlife that some many people come here to experience. Allowing any Off Road Vehicles into wildlife areas can be catastrophic to the local fauna. Adopting a plan that would increase ORV use would be a mistake that would lead to declining wildlife, degrading ecosystems and finally a decline in tourism. These areas need to be protected from vehicle damage in order to continue to have this wonderful area to live and visit.

Correspondence ID: 7559 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:28:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: There are not enough peaceful, tranquil places left in the United States. Allowing noise and air pollution from ORV is unconscionable.

Correspondence ID: 7560 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Pucak, Carol J
Received: May,07,2010 12:28:06
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: It is not necessary to be on a motorized vehicle to enjoy wild areas but ORV do ruin the land and the experience for other users. Please keep these areas free from noise and air pollution and free from the damage ORV cause.

Correspondence ID: 7561 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Cleveland, Robert
Received: May,07,2010 12:28:09
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
- 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7562 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
As a recent visitor to Cape Hatteras National Seashore it is vital that the seashore be protected for its wilderness setting. Recreational impact should be minimal and leave the land as undisturbed as possible. ORV use is in conflict with this perspective.
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with

its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Sincerely, Dee Leggett

Correspondence ID: 7563 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:28:10
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please limit off-road vehicle driving on the Cape Hatteras shoreline. Our outer banks wildlife is already under enough threat from climate change, hurricanes and pollution. The birds and turtles that make their homes in this area will not survive for future generations to enjoy if we don't protect them now!

Correspondence ID: 7564 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:28:10
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: It is time to put a STOP to extending privileges to OFF ROAD VEHICLES. Much of the NC area is historical; remember Plymouth wasn't the first English colony. My daughter lives in Greensboro NC and we often visit the OUTER BANKS of NC. There is lots of wilderness in the USA and those who have ORV are NOT welcome in their own neighborhoods. Let them go out in the woods. Those who drive with any care for anything are few and far between. The beaches are there for recreation. Keep them that way.

Correspondence ID: 7565 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: N/A, N/A
Received: May,07,2010 12:28:14
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: This is just like keeping snowmobiles out of Yellowstone and Yosemite, it should be a no brainer Keep MOTOR VEHICLES off Hatteras shore line.

Correspondence ID: 7566 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Sanford, Timothy R
Received: May,07,2010 12:28:17
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please limit ORV access to the Cape Hatteras National Seashore so that the natural resources of that wonderful area are not damaged further and so that native wildlife can rebound to previous levels. If nothing else, please limit ORV access to a small proportion of the seashore, and reserve the rest for pedestrian access and the wildlife for who the seashore is so important. Once wildlife are lost and natural areas are despoiled, there is no going back. Let's not regret what we've done when our grandchildren ask what the Outer Banks used to be like! Thank you for your consideration.

Correspondence ID: 7567 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:28:17
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: ORV traffic should never override the needs of wildlife or pedestrians. ORV's are noisy, destructive to the environment and spew fumes into air. Quite frankly they should not be allowed in any national park area, but if they must be allowed, their access should be limited and heavily regulated. Think of birds, people along a quiet beach watching and listening to the waves roll in. Do you suddenly want to hear the loud noise of an ORV and smell the fumes from the engine? There are plenty of places for ORV's to go, there are getting to be fewer and fewer places that we can all go for peace and quiet and communing with nature. Please consider your actions carefully.

Correspondence ID: 7568 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Bambrick, John
Received: May,07,2010 12:28:18
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7569 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:28:19

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Very Respectfully, Sandra K. Lynne Member, NPCA

Correspondence ID: 7570 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:28:36

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: ATVs and other vehicles do not belong on beaches. These are quite spaces where people go to getaway from it all, relax and enjoy fresh air. It would also endanger any kids - or people for that matter - who use the beach.

Correspondence ID: 7571 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:28:36

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Richard D. McAnulty

Correspondence ID: 7572 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:28:38

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: This is atrocious. It does not take a rocket scientist to realize that wildlife will be smashed to death by ORVs. As a lifelong resident of California, I have seen the uninhabited beach in my area slowly disintegrate from a thriving tidepool community into lifeless sand and rocks. People move here and don't even know what was there before so they think everything is just fine when in fact dozens of species have gone extinct from the shore in only 2 decades. I cannot even fathom the long term consequences for a beach that allows ORVs on it. It will be lifeless in a matter of months.

Correspondence ID: 7573 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: grissom, ruth ann
Received: May,07,2010 12:28:39

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence:

Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7574 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May.07,2010 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

***** Thank you very much for taking the time to protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again!

Sincerely,
W.O. Logan

Correspondence ID: 7575 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: Conrad, Norm

Received: May.07,2010 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Superintendent Murray,

Later this month I will be visiting the Outer Banks. I am a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks. Thank you for the opportunity to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. Vacationers like myself, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches cherish this resource. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement favor ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, IF it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7576 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May.07,2010 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

***** Thank you very much for taking the time to protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again!

Sincerely,
Shelley Gompers

Correspondence ID:	7577	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	
Name:	platt, audrey					
Received:	May,07,2010 12:29:02					
Correspondence Type:	Web Form					
Correspondence:	off-road vehicles are becoming a destructive presence in National Parks nationwide. An example are the noisy and dangerous snowmobiles in Yellowstone. To increase numbers of these vehicles in the Cape Hatteras National Seashore would be a terrible mistake - destructive to endangered animals and plants and destructive to the people who visit the Seashore hoping for quiet and tranquility.					
Correspondence ID:	7578	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	
Name:	Nixon, James T					
Received:	May,07,2010 12:29:08					
Correspondence Type:	Web Form					
Correspondence:	Please don't do this. Please take a look at what has happend in Moab, Utah and other places. Thank you, Jim Nixon					
Correspondence ID:	7579	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	
Name:	N/A, N/A					
Received:	May,07,2010 12:29:08					
Correspondence Type:	Web Form					
Correspondence:	Wildlife and pedestrian visitors are what keeps seashores natural and alive. We should not allow their distruction by allowing ORV traffic at the expense of life !!!					
Correspondence ID:	7580	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	
Name:	Trimble, Peggy					
Received:	May,07,2010 12:29:08					
Correspondence Type:	Web Form					
Correspondence:	As a frequent vacationer on the Outer Banks I am very concerned about this proposal. The commercialism of thee island has all ready taken it's toll and to open up more lands that will endanger the all ready fragile wild life is very upsetting. Areas like this must be preserved for the future. Please block this ruling.					
Correspondence ID:	7581	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	
Name:	Garcia, Mary					
Received:	May,07,2010 12:29:11					
Correspondence Type:	Web Form					
Correspondence:	Let us do the right thing, is for the greater good that we protect our land and sea scape. PLEASE think about your own offspring as well as mine. Thank you.					
Correspondence ID:	7582	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private: Y
Name:	private					
Received:	May,07,2010 12:29:11					
Correspondence Type:	Web Form					
Correspondence:	Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."					

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7583 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:29:16
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7584 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Lovejoy, Patricia M
Received: May,07,2010 12:29:20
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7585 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Pavese, Robert R
Received: May,07,2010 12:29:22
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: We need a quiet environment, and an ecologically responsible policy

Correspondence ID: 7586 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Cornelia, Jared
Received: May,07,2010 12:29:22
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7587 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: Worcester, Chris

Received: May,07,2010 12:29:24

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7588 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: Spaulding, Stephen J

Received: May,07,2010 12:29:27

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: There are places on the planet where motorized vehicles do not belong. Please preserve Cape Hatteras National Seashore for appropriate enjoyment by people who are willing to leave their vehicles behind.

Correspondence ID: 7589 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: Daiss, Becky

Received: May,07,2010 12:29:28

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7590 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: Engel, Gordon R

Received: May,07,2010 12:29:42

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please do not allow off-road vehicle use in the delicate and pristine environment of Cape Hatteras!

Correspondence ID: 7591 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 12:29:45

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that

make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7592 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: N/A, N/A
Received: May.07,2010 12:29:48
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7593 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May.07,2010 12:29:50
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please DO NOT allow ORV on the Cape Hatteras National seashore. The seashore should be for preservation and this use does not fit in. There

alternatives to ORV use areas but limited areas we can protect and preserve.

Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7594 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Cornelia, Jared
Received: May.07,2010 12:29:52
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take

precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7595 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 12:29:54

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: We already have an impending disaster with the oil spill. Hatteras is one of the few places on the continental us where one can enjoy tranquility and peace on clead pristine beaches. What kind of message are we sending by allowing that to be destroyed by oil/gas gussling vehicles. HOW IRONIC! YOU have the responsibility to PROTECT our public lands. NOW DO IT! The Park Service should be spearheading the concept that the natural world can be enjoyed without using entertainment that contributes to pollution, global warming, and turns up the USA's disgusting appatite for more oil. So what is your choice? Protecting our resources or Promoting Big oil If it is the second, then why do we need to support the NPS????!

Correspondence ID: 7596 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 12:29:58

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7597 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: Noel, Letitia

Received: May,07,2010 12:30:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I don't understand where ORVs fit into a primitive wilderness, unless there is an emergency and they are serving a particular need for transportation.
Thank You

Correspondence ID: 7598 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 12:30:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: There is already too much vehicle access to the beaches around Cape Hatteras. Nothing should be done that will allow even more vehicle access.

Correspondence ID: 7599 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 12:30:05

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I would simply ask that you avoid allowing off-road vehicles on Cape Hatteras NS. There are certainly plenty of places for these vehicles, and a site as pristine as Cape Hatteras should be maintained as just that - pristine.
We as a nation need to show the world how much we value our natural resources.

Correspondence ID: 7600 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 12:30:09

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: There are so few pristine locations left along the United States coastline. I feel that it is our duty to protect our valuable coastline areas as they are home to a wide variety of animal and plant life that deserve an undisturbed habitat. It is hard to police the use of off-road vehicle usage and unfortunately there are people who will take advantage of any new regulations around off-road usage that may cause harm to themselves and the coastline areas around them.

We need to consider the environmental impact whenever decisions such as these are raised. Considerations that need to be made in a thoughtful and informative manner, and that do not cater too much to any special interest group.

I hope that after careful consideration you will determine that there is truly no real benefit to opening the Cape Hatteras Recreational Area coastline to off-road vehicles, and will preserve this area for current and future generations to enjoy.

Thank you for your time and consideration!

Correspondence ID:	7601	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	
Name:	Benjamin, James L					
Received:	May,07,2010 12:30:11					
Correspondence Type:	Web Form					
Correspondence:	<p>Dear Superintendent Murray,</p> <p>As a former planning commissioner and resident of a coastal community, I deeply appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.</p> <p>1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."</p> <p>2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.</p> <p>3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.</p> <p>Thank you for considering my comments.</p>					
Correspondence ID:	7602	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	
Name:	N/A, N/A					
Received:	May,07,2010 12:30:11					
Correspondence Type:	Web Form					
Correspondence:	<p>As a volunteer, I have worked with several environmental groups repairing sites that ORV's devastated. It takes only one ORV to do damage that might take 10 people to repair in 10 hours. There are already hundreds of miles of trails set aside for snowmobiles and other ORV machines. It defies logic that these noisy, polluting, and damaging machines are given permission to further devastate land and animal and plant life. Who are the powerhouses behind this permission? Surely, no one who lives in the area. Those in favor of ORVs should have to visit their activity and access the damage left behind. Are we such a rich country that we have nothing better to do or spend our money on than clean up after the spoiled and the ignorant ? WE have plenty of natural disasters to attend to and right now we are all worried about the BP spill and the coal mines that practice poor judgement. The list gets longer every day. Why would our Secretary of Interior or Congress or our President even let this preventable trouble emerge as a vote or a consideration?</p>					
Correspondence ID:	7603	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	
Name:	Durrenberger, Joe					
Received:	May,07,2010 12:30:17					
Correspondence Type:	Web Form					
Correspondence:	While the majority of off-roaders are responsible, far too many are not. Their careless ,reckless actions can not be excused.					
Correspondence ID:	7604	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	
Name:	Amsden, Liz					
Received:	May,07,2010 12:30:18					
Correspondence Type:	Web Form					
Correspondence:	<p>As a dedicated conservationist with a lifelong appreciation of the natural world, I am writing to vehemently oppose any off road vehicle use of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore area which is not park service related.</p> <p>I go to the parks to replenish my soul. Not to hear revving engines, see roadkill and breathe the fumes of combustion engines. Let some enterprising person build a park somewhere far from the habitats and humans who want to enjoy the Hatteras seashore.</p> <p>Noise pollution, air pollution, habitat endangerment, despoiling of foliage, ruining of nesting areas, killing of animals & birds, injury of hikers - all for what?</p> <p>We've seen it in Yosemite and elsewhere. It has to stop.</p> <p>Just say NO to ANY "sports" off road vehicle use Cape Hatteras National Seashore area. Now and forever.</p>					
Correspondence ID:	7605	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private: Y
Name:	private					
Received:	May,07,2010 12:30:29					
Correspondence Type:	Web Form					
Correspondence:	Offroad vehicles can essentially destroy the use of Cape Hatteras for animals living there and for visitors trying to quietly enjoy the those animals and their habitat. Please reconsider allowing offroad vehicles in the park.					
Correspondence ID:	7606	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private: Y
Name:	private					
Received:	May,07,2010 12:30:31					
Correspondence Type:	Web Form					
Correspondence:	<p>Dear Superintendent Murray,</p> <p>As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.</p>					

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan. Save the Beach! It is too beautiful down there to muke it up with offroad vehicles. Thank you.

Correspondence ID:	7607	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,07,2010 00:00:00						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	<p>Dear Superintendent Murray,</p> <p>As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.</p> <p>1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."</p> <p>2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.</p> <p>3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.</p> <p>***** Thank you very much for taking the time to protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again!</p> <p>Sincerely, Roberta K Gibboney</p>						
Correspondence ID:	7608	Project:	10641	Document:	32596		
Name:	Aughey, Arlene						
Received:	May,07,2010 12:30:36						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	We al know the time has long come to preserve this precious piece of Earth.						
Correspondence ID:	7609	Project:	10641	Document:	32596		
Name:	Morgan, Linda G						
Received:	May,07,2010 12:30:40						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	Please preserve the natural environment by not allowing three and four-wheelers access to the beach. The old days of people driving their cars on the beach, motorcycles, etc. are over, and this is the same thing. Thank you for our consideration.						
Correspondence ID:	7610	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,07,2010 12:30:42						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	Off-road vehicles on the dunes around Cape Hatteras? Ridiculous! The light house was relocated several years ago because of dune erosion from the ocean. What would happen if OVR's are allowed to navigate the dunes? They would destroy sea oats and other vegetation that defend the dunes from erosion. PLEASE - DO NOT PERMIT OVR'S TO BE USED NOT ONLY AT CAPE HATTERAS, BUT AT ANY NATIONAL PARK SITE. Thank you.						
Correspondence ID:	7611	Project:	10641	Document:	32596		
Name:	Williams, Donna E						
Received:	May,07,2010 12:30:44						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	I have spent many summers enjoying the Cape Hatteras National Seashore. My family enjoys this area for its prestine beauty. The wildlife and sea grasses that are present in this area are too fragile to support off-road vehicles. Off road vehicles have no place in this wildlife refuge.						
Correspondence ID:	7612	Project:	10641	Document:	32596		
Name:	Rosenthal, Ann						
Received:	May,07,2010 12:30:45						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	<p>Dear Superintendent Murray,</p> <p>As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft</p>						

plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
- 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan. I do not think that ORV use can be consistent with wilderness protection. Please continue to act to protect our wilderness. Thank you. Sincerely, Ann Rosenthal

Correspondence ID: 7613 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Rubel, Scott
Received: May,07,2010 12:30:57
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: There are plenty of natural places being handed over to offroad vehicles. This does not need to be one of them.

Correspondence ID: 7614 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:31:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
As a parent, grandparent, and supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7615 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:31:05
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7616 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:31:13
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Good afternoon. I write as a person who visited the Outer Banks every summer as a child, and looked forward to it the rest of the year. The beautiful shoreline, beach and sound side, were the primary reason I grew up to be an avid supporter of National Parks, wild coastlines, and Mother Nature herself. Please do not let this fantastic natural resource be spoiled by off-road vehicles of any kind. The cost in habitat degradation, breeding disruption, and aesthetic compromise is far too great. The area should be protected as the beautiful, peaceful, fecund place that it ought to remain. Thank you. Sincerely, Lindsay Suter, AIA, LEED AP, Yale University

Correspondence ID: 7617 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Dunham, Christopher
Received: May,07,2010 12:31:16
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
As a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off-Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7618 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:31:17
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please keep Off Road Vehicles (ORVs) out of Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 7619 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: O'Neill, Erin
Received: May,07,2010 12:31:18
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Off road vehicles are completely unnecessary Cape Hatteras National Seashore. I urge you to reconsider - more nature, less noise and pollution. Thanks!

Correspondence ID: 7620 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: It has been brought to the attention of the kiteboarding community that a variety of plans are being considered in response to proposed environmental and ecological concerns. The Outer Banks of North Carolina is a sanctuary for many beach goers, sports enthusiasts, wildlife observers and most importantly, the natural environment. We, as a community, feel that it is important for the environment to be protected and thus understand certain steps may be needed to achieve this goal. Thank you for evaluating the options to improve the environmental conditions at one of the greatest destinations in the United States of America.
However, with the aforementioned said, please consider the responses you choose carefully. Minimalist environmental management approaches have worked well throughout the United States' National Parks. Closing extensive sections of beaches, the sound, and water ways will strip away the very nature and reason for why we appreciate the land in its current state. It can be said with great certainty that all frequent and casual users of this place intend to preserve its natural beauty and respect its wildlife.
We strongly feel that the Historical, Cultural, and Economic ramifications of the proposed plans have not been adequately addressed by the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) as is required.
Should the environmental changes impact our communities' sport (as it would in Plans D, E, & F) we would be forced to reconsider our frequent and environmentally friendly utilization of the Outer Banks. Other user groups such as surfers, fishermen, beachcombers, and virtually all other forms of tourism will also be discouraged from visiting Cape Hatteras if beach closures are greatly expanded. This will have a severely negative impact on the local economy and way of life that the residents of Hatteras Island have enjoyed for many generations. It will also take away something that is important to the lives of thousands of people throughout the United States and around the world.
If people, and especially children, can not experience the environment how are they going to learn to help you protect the environment?

Correspondence ID: 7621 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Beaven, Nancie
Received: May,07,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.
I spent many two week spring and fall vacations with my father on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore, and it would be a travesty to destroy this wildlife protected habitat.
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take

precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7622 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:31:25
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
As a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.
Sincerely,
Heide M. Doss

Correspondence ID: 7623 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:31:31
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Recreational vehicles have no place on either desert or coastal sands. Only damage to our environment and wildlife result from this senseless "sport".

Correspondence ID: 7624 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Cox, B. Lea
Received: May,07,2010 12:31:33
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: ORVs do not belong in sensitive wildlife areas. They are destructive and they spoil the environment not only for natural inhabitants but for visitors as well. Please keep ORVs from Cape Hatteras.

Correspondence ID: 7625 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:31:40
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Off road vehicles destroy plants, animals, and the noise pollution is horrible.
People go to seashores to enjoy the sound of wildlife and surf and off road vehicles.

Correspondence ID: 7626 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: N/A, N/A
Received: May,07,2010 12:31:41
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear NPS Managers-
Our National Parks should not allow off-road vehicles to destroy their value as places of tranquility and public refuge.
Please do not adopt this disastrous plan.

Correspondence ID: 7627 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:31:41
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take

precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Sincerely, Mary White

Correspondence ID: 7628 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Kaplan, David A
Received: May,07,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

***** Thank you very much for taking the time to protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again!

Sincerely,
David A Kaplan

Correspondence ID: 7629 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,

Although I have not visited the beaches of Cape Hatteras, I love them as an historic and immeasurably valuable treasure of our eastern seaboard. I associate Cape Hatteras with an amusing encounter in France. An artist told me of her American friend who lived in "Capattara". It took me a while to figure out that she meant "Cape Hatteras", pronounced as French. I can only imagine what the artist's American friend must think about the noise and destruction that always accompanies off road vehicles. I am shocked at the thought that alternatives are being entertained that would allow for this kind of degradation of the environment. The fact that people buy off road vehicles does not automatically mean they have a right to drive them wherever they wish.

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

***** Thank you very much for taking the time to protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again!

Sincerely, Jane C Maher

Correspondence ID: 7630 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:31:51
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: My wife and I are relative new comers to the Outer Banks of NC. We discovered this veritable paradise in 2003 and have been frequent visitors to lower Hatteras Island since. We enjoy the area so much that we purchased ocean front property in Hatteras Village. Although we continue to make our home

in Rockville, MD, we spend several months each year seeking to enjoy the National Seashore in our area. Our primary recreational activities relative to the beach include fishing, with the assistance of our ORV, and walking on the beach (during which we routinely pick up trash for later disposal in our dumpster). The beach, along with its recreational opportunities, is what brings us to the Outer Banks! Although we love birds and animals and enjoy viewing them, we believe that society's desire to protect and preserve selected species of birds and other wildlife needs to be "balanced" against legitimate human access to the unique recreational opportunities offered by National Seashore beaches on the Outer Banks. We therefore disagree with any beach management approach, which would prevent human access to and recreational use of beaches!! I cannot make this point too emphatically! We believe that there are always creative ways available to manage human activities while protecting threatened and endangered species. The challenge for our legislatures, our courts and regulatory authorities is to find a reasonable compromise, which recognizes that people are the highest order of beings..., and deserve to be given priority.

We strongly disagree with the "NPS Preferred Alternative F" because we consider it to be too restrictive of human recreational access. It does not demonstrate why such a severe level of restriction is needed. There is no proven scientific basis that any shorebird requires a 1,000 meter or larger buffer zone to prevent harm from human presence. Any buffer requirement should start as small as practicable, such as 10-20 meters. A buffer size should only be increased with the support of valid video-documented evidence that the existing buffer size is insufficient to prevent physical harm to the species. "Harm" should not include occasional "defensive posturing" or other normal and routine actions, including flight.

Pedestrian foot traffic such as anglers, surfers, beachcombers, runners, etc., which are commonly seen on beaches, should always be allowed on beaches. Any proposed buffer zones for pedestrians should be substantially smaller than corresponding buffer zones that pertain to vehicles. No protection scheme should include a ban on foot traffic/pedestrian use! There is no evidence that shorebirds or other species are harmed in any way by pedestrians when given a small buffer zone to protect nesting activity. Logic would indicate that a bird would typically not choose to nest in an area or amidst any level of activity, which it found to be uncomfortable or disruptive to its reproductive routine.

Outer Banks NPS-managed beaches should be an example of smart co-existence and balanced management practices, not extremist bans and excessive management practices driven by fear of punitive law suits. The current process appears to be driven, in part, by "single-issue groups", who would seek to restrict the rights and recreational opportunities of the majority solely to further their well intended, but extreme views of appropriate conservation measures.

We agree with and support the positions established by the Coalition for Beach Access (see <http://www.obpa-nc.org/position/statement.pdf> and <http://www.obpa-nc.org/position/assessment.pdf>).

We agree with and support the positions established by Dare County, NC (see <http://www.hatterasislandtimes.com/PDFs/DCDEIS.pdf>).

Thank you for extending the opportunity for public comment. I trust that you will weigh our views carefully in finalizing any regulatory regimes, which would restrict our access to land which we as U.S. Citizens own in common.

Sam & Edith McKeen

Correspondence ID: 7631 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Norris, Joanne W
Received: May.07,2010 12:31:53
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,

I visited Cape Hatteras on vacation many years ago and still remember the natural beauty of the terrain, how quiet and peaceful it was.

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
- 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7632 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May.07,2010 12:32:06
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: With all the noise in the world today, places like a seashore are for relaxation, not the active noisy, air polluting use of off-road vehicles. If you allow them, then they will be the only ones to enjoy them, eliminating all other uses.
Please keep them confined to use elsewhere.
Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 7633 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May.07,2010 12:32:08
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I do not believe that any ORV's should be allowed on Cape Hatteras National Seashore Park. These vehicles disturb the wildlife, run over nests, run over plants, disturb people with the noise that they make, smell of gasoline and give the park rangers something else to control. People are there to enjoy the beach and the water and being in tune with nature. ORV's destroy the environment and the peace and tranquility of the entire park.
We have roads all over this country and these ORV's should only be used on roads, not here. What are they thinking!!!! PLEASE DO NOT ALLOW THIS TO HAPPEN!!!!!!

Correspondence ID: 7634 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Purcell, Regina G
Received: May.07,2010 12:32:09
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: It's imperative that the government keep Cape Hatteras free of off-road vehicles to preserve the natural beauty and forgo noise pollution.

Correspondence ID:	7635	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	
Name:	N/A, N/A					
Received:	May,07,2010 12:32:19					
Correspondence Type:	Web Form					
Correspondence:	I am writing to comment on the Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Natural beauty is always irrevocably damaged by the introduction of motor vehicles. Beaches, deserts, mountains and wilderness areas provide a life-sustaining beauty, peace and quiet only as long as they are left free of noise and air polluting vehicles. Even if your only concern is money, the natural environment will draw many more tourists if you don't sell out to the small, noisy and obnoxious few who think all enjoyment comes from speed and noise. I urge you to keep the Cape Hatteras National Seashore vehicle free.					
Correspondence ID:	7636	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	
Name:	scharf, william c					
Received:	May,07,2010 12:32:21					
Correspondence Type:	Web Form					
Correspondence:	Stop the ATVs.					
Correspondence ID:	7637	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	
Name:	Frederick, Gwen A					
Received:	May,07,2010 12:32:24					
Correspondence Type:	Web Form					
Correspondence:	Don't you have any respect for the natural earth? You have to destroy everything? You don't have enough places to ride your noisy, stinky vehicles? Are you crazy? Can't you find someplace else to ride your vehicles? Like a road. Cement. Not pristine wilderness. Not where wildlife live. Not where people are trying to get away from the noise and traffic. Is that the purpose of this? So you can destroy the quiet and beauty of nature? Is that the thrill? I think human beings are reverting backwards sometimes.					
Correspondence ID:	7638	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private: Y
Name:	private					
Received:	May,07,2010 12:32:25					
Correspondence Type:	Web Form					
Correspondence:	<p>Dear Superintendent Murray,</p> <p>As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.</p> <p>1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."</p> <p>2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.</p> <p>3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.</p>					
Correspondence ID:	7639	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private: Y
Name:	private					
Received:	May,07,2010 12:32:34					
Correspondence Type:	Web Form					
Correspondence:	we need habitat for critters much more than we need trails for off road ATV"S. It is a no brainer. Bill Moore					
Correspondence ID:	7640	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	
Name:	N/A, N/A					
Received:	May,07,2010 12:32:35					
Correspondence Type:	Web Form					
Correspondence:	<p>Dear Superintendent Murray,</p> <p>As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.</p> <p>1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."</p> <p>2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.</p> <p>3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best</p>					

examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7641 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:32:49
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7642 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Will, David
Received: May,07,2010 12:32:52
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please revise ORV (Off-Road Vehicle) management plans for Cape Hatteras National Seashore to protect the pristine qualities of one of the most beautiful stretches of Atlantic Coast in the United States. ORV use is inappropriate at Cape Hatteras National Seashore and should not be allowed to impair the visitor experience and degrade the natural resources protected by the National Park Service. ORV use will prevent all visitors from experiencing the special qualities of Cape Hatteras and will cause irreversible harm to the wildlife and natural resources of a treasured park. Please eliminate and certainly please do not grant expanded ORV access in Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Thank you for considering my point of view.

Correspondence ID: 7643 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Day, Linda A
Received: May,07,2010 12:32:58
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am opposed to the current plan to allow ORV traffic on the Cape Hatteras beaches. As someone who enjoys walking the beach, watching the birds, and listening to the roar of the waves -- in short, nature -- I object strongly to turning Cape Hatteras into another location for the noisy fume-spewing, gas-guzzling machines that dominate the rest of our lives! The National Park Service should be working to protect our natural heritage, not fill it with the same metal mess that clutters the rest of our landscape.
The ORV use plan for Cape Hatteras is like booking helicopter flights over the Grand Canyon -- if you eliminate the natural environment (by filling it with "civilization") you eliminate an essential part of our national character.
Please ditch this plan! Let the metal-heads go elsewhere.
Sincerely, Linda Day

Correspondence ID: 7644 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Wiewandt, Thomas A
Received: May,07,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Gentlemen/women:
The wild character of a large share of the magnificent beaches in the Southeast have already been destroyed by overuse and vehicle traffic. Places for quiet contemplation are rare nowadays.
And as stress mounts in our modern world, we must act to protect such places that allow future generations to collect their thoughts, reflect, and think productively. Here's a typical comment from visitors to the Cape Hatteras National Seashore: "My husband and I FINALLY found a beach that we completely and absolutely loved."
I therefore urge you to keep our Cape Hatteras National Seashore completely off-limits to ORV traffic.
Sincerely, Thomas A. Wiewandt

Correspondence ID: 7645 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:33:04
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of

the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Sincerely,
Richard Moore

Correspondence ID: 7646 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:33:05
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
 - 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."
- Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
- 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7647 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:33:06
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: As a frequent traveller to that area for many years, I would beg that you give priority to the human and wildlife whole do not want to be assaulted by the huge noise pollution that atv's and motorbikes bring to National Parks areas. There would be NO relaxation, and little wildlife observations to be had, if this noise is given more priority than the natural setting of the park. There should be no reason for giving "noise" and "park destruction", as inevitably occurs with these machines, ANY priority in our Parks, particularly Beach & Dune areas. Parks are for PEOPLE, NOT machines !!!

Thank you

Correspondence ID: 7648 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Cullen, Dale
Received: May,07,2010 12:33:06
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
 - 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."
- Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
- 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7649 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Henry, Devin
Received: May,07,2010 12:33:07
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D,

if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7650 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7651 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: George, M.S.
Received: May,07,2010 12:33:20
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Our National Parks and the biological diversity that they preserve are the keystone of our critically important natural resources. We must remain vigilant and aggressive in protecting these resources for ourselves and future generations.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7652 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:33:27
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of

future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7653 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: Brust, Angela C

Received: May,07,2010 12:33:29

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7654 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: Webb, Jeanette

Received: May,07,2010 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As a supporter of national parks I wish to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to consider family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches or to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant.

The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

Congress specifically designated Cape Hatteras a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

Accordingly, the final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Correspondence ID: 7655 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 12:33:39

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7656 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I strongly support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Respectfully,
Wendy Jewell

Correspondence ID: 7657 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:33:41
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: PLEASE....no more ORV in the Cape Hatteras Seashore area. Give the wild life a chance to survive in that beautiful area Cara O'Neill

Correspondence ID: 7658 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
I have rode my fat-tire bicycle with friends on the Cape Hatteras sands during the cool Spring weather for a few years. I marvel at its serene and majestic natural beauty -- I believe the off-road vehicle predominance would compromise one of the great experiences that makes me coming back to visit your coastline.
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.
I really hope you'll choose this plan! Thank you so very much!
Christiane

Correspondence ID: 7659 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: N/A, N/A
Received: May,07,2010 12:34:01
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and

analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID:	7660	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	
Name:	miller, russell h					
Received:	May,07,2010 12:34:09					
Correspondence Type:	Web Form					
Correspondence:	At a time when the USA is trying to decrease our carbon foot print it makes no sense to allow off-road or motorized vehicles in the Cape Hatteras National Park. They are loud, dangerous to other users of the park, damaging to the flora and fauna and polluting. Keep them out. There is no need for them to be there. Thank you.					
Correspondence ID:	7661	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	
Name:	N/A, N/A					
Received:	May,07,2010 12:34:10					
Correspondence Type:	Web Form					
Correspondence:	leave it for wildlife					
Correspondence ID:	7662	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	
Name:	Darrow, Delana R					
Received:	May,07,2010 12:34:14					
Correspondence Type:	Web Form					
Correspondence:	Been strating a nieghberhood trash pickup and been helping replant thr roads in my area,getting children involed cleaning up gardening..					
Correspondence ID:	7663	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private: Y
Name:	private					
Received:	May,07,2010 00:00:00					
Correspondence Type:	Web Form					
Correspondence:	<p>Dear Superintendent Murray,</p> <p>As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. <p>Please keep awful ORVs off of our supposedly protected seashores and out of our parks where people go to be in NATURE. Limit ORV usage to second or third-quality public land if people simply must pursue such a noise and exhaust pollution creating form of recreation. Animals hate ORVs and so do the vast majority of people, and we as a country will not enjoy the continued economic benefits of international and domestic ecotourism if our natural places become polluted, compromised, or unenjoyable because of the noise and other nuisances posed by ORVs. Not only are they nuisances offensive to wildlife and park visitors who are trying to get away from internal combustion engines and their pollution if only for a little while, they are quite dangerous as well to operators, passengers, and people in the vicinity, as a review of legal cases involving ORV accidents and injuries amply demonstrates.</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.</p>					
Correspondence ID:	7664	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private: Y
Name:	private					
Received:	May,07,2010 12:34:21					
Correspondence Type:	Web Form					
Correspondence:	<p>Dear Superintendent Murray,</p> <p>As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. <p>Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.</p>					

Correspondence ID: 7665 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: LaFlamme, Jeff P
Received: May,07,2010 12:34:27
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7666 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Hinrichs, Pamela J
Received: May,07,2010 12:34:35
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please protect open space...our beaches...from nonsense like driving on them. Cars add to the demise of these sensitive ecosystems. Besides, what happened to walking along the beach? Thank you!

Correspondence ID: 7667 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:34:36
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.
Please protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of seashore.

Correspondence ID: 7668 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:34:41
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID:	7669	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	
Name:	Sabo, Judith L					
Received:	May,07,2010 12:34:43					
Correspondence Type:	Web Form					
Correspondence:	<p>NO GOOD will come with allowing off-road vehicles access to beach areas. It's a guarantee to lose wildlife, their habitats with the noises, plant life, and then gain pollution from fuels, beer and soda cans, trash from partiers and weekend warriors' activities. California beaches, ocean, rivers, lakes, all are examples of human tragedies and damages.</p> <p>If the beach is pristine, there is a reason it is pristine....humans haven't yet tried to destroy it for others.</p> <p>Ban off-road vehicles and enforce it!!!</p>					
Correspondence ID:	7670	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private: Y
Name:	private					
Received:	May,07,2010 00:00:00					
Correspondence Type:	Web Form					
Correspondence:	<p>As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. <p>Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.</p> <p>***** Thank you very much for taking the time to protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again!</p> <p>Sincerely, Catherine McQuigg</p>					
Correspondence ID:	7671	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private: Y
Name:	private					
Received:	May,07,2010 12:34:45					
Correspondence Type:	Web Form					
Correspondence:	<p>It is about time these people realize once we lose this there is no way to get it back. It takes so many years to create most of these sites and to let it be damaged and destroyed over recreational vehicles is crap. It should be saved so everyone can enjoy it. Driving all over it destroying what cannot be restored is an insane action. These people need to do their job of protecting areas for all to enjoy and not just the few that want to hot rod thru the area and not respecting animal and plant life.</p>					
Correspondence ID:	7672	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private: Y
Name:	private					
Received:	May,07,2010 12:34:49					
Correspondence Type:	Web Form					
Correspondence:	<p>Dear Superintendent Murray,</p> <p>As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. <p>Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.</p>					
Correspondence ID:	7673	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	
Name:	N/A, N/A					
Received:	May,07,2010 12:34:53					
Correspondence Type:	Web Form					
Correspondence:	Leave the beaches for the natural things...					

Correspondence ID:	7674	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,07,2010 12:35:01						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	<p>Dear Superintendent Murray,</p> <p>As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.</p> <p>1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."</p> <p>2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.</p> <p>3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.</p>						
Correspondence ID:	7675	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,07,2010 12:35:05						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	<p>There can be no excuse for allowing disproportionate access by off-road vehicles to Cape Hatteras National Seashore, shortchanging pedestrians, quiet recreationsists and wildlife.</p> <p>Regardless of what public land off-road vehicles are allowed on, the result has been excessive noise, dust and damage to habitats. Research in national parks, forests and wildlife management areas has revealed that off-road vehicles overwhelmingly are responsible for habitat degradation over any other activity.</p> <p>We must stand up the the assault by motorized vehicles on our natural environment.</p> <p>Quite recreation, such as that practiced by pedestrians, birders, campers and hikers not only makes a much lighter footprint on the land but conserves fossil fuels for essential uses.</p> <p>DO NOT ALLOW OFF-ROAD VEHICLES ON ANY NATIONAL SEASHORE.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Randa Robinson-Anderson</p>						
Correspondence ID:	7676	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,07,2010 12:35:13						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	<p>It is unthinkable that off-road vehicles should be allowed at the Cape Hatteras National seashore. Noise pollution, in addition to the impact of wheels and gas fumes are antithetical to the peaceful nature of the National seashore. Please, no vehicles at all should be allowed, especially these noisy smelly vehicles.</p>						
Correspondence ID:	7677	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	
Name:	Hill, Kimberly J						
Received:	May,07,2010 12:35:15						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	<p>I ask that you keep Cape Hatteras closed to off road activity. This activity always ends up in unwanted destruction of sensitive areas. We are running out of open spaces in this country to just enjoy the beauty of nature.</p> <p>Thank You.</p>						
Correspondence ID:	7678	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	
Name:	Tranberg, Debra M						
Received:	May,07,2010 12:35:19						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	<p>Please do not ORV use at Cape Nat'l Seashore. This can only adversely affect habitat and other less invasive use.</p> <p>Debra M. Tranberg, D.C.</p>						
Correspondence ID:	7679	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	
Name:	Sunde Jr, Robert J						
Received:	May,07,2010 12:35:21						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	<p>Motorized vehicles of any kind have as much business on the Cape Hatteras National Seashore as an oil slick does on the beaches of the Gulf of Mexico. Ban them!</p>						
Correspondence ID:	7680	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,07,2010 00:00:00						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	<p>Dear Superintendent Murray,</p> <p>As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with</p>						

its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7681 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:35:38
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7682 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Yingling, Jacob
Received: May,07,2010 12:35:41
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: In Plan F, why are non-endangered species, such as American Oystercatchers, Least Terns and Colonial Waterbird given pre-Nesting closures and buffers up to 300 meters? As stated in a previous comment, reasonable measures should be taken to preserve wildlife, however a 300 meter buffer is excessive, and needs to be reevaluated. Instead of a 300 meter buffer, a 30 meter buffer should be considered. The 30 meter buffer will provide more than adequate protection from pedestrians, and off road vehicles. What scientific evidence supports the recommended 300 meter buffer?
I ask for the opportunity to prove that human interaction has, in any way, negatively impacted the breeding habits of plovers, oystercatchers, terns, waterbirds, etc. The economies of Dare & Hyde counties are in disarray because of the Consent Decree, and the NPS' unwillingness to consider those in economic plight is disappointing and disheartening.

Correspondence ID: 7683 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Gilbert, Sandy J
Received: May,07,2010 12:35:43
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Stop the ORV from invading pristine places for our wildlife, it's their home !!! My God, can't we save anything for the animals.....do we have to put our dirty feet and autos and garbage EVERYWHERE!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

Correspondence ID: 7684 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:35:48
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the

pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7685 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Gehman, Betsy & Steve
Received: May,07,2010 12:35:54
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
 - 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
 - 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.
- Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7686 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Starr, Andrew
Received: May,07,2010 12:35:56
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: My stance is simple: Cape Hatteras belongs to wildlife and people. In a world where natural resources for the peaceful co-existence of mankind and wildlife are shrinking, it is imperative that we fiercely protect nature's gems with every fiber of our being. The onslaught of ORV's will most assuredly destroy this precious gift. The decision to permit this to occur is both asinine and bizarre, showcasing little regard for yet another of nature's sanctuaries...a foolish mistake with damning repercussions that will be quickly realized. God has provided a brilliant opportunity to cherish, love and protect this natural splendor; failure to do what's right is an insult to God and a fierce blow to the face of humanity. Come now--do you REALLY THINK this is appropriate?

Correspondence ID: 7687 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:36:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
- 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments
Sincerely, Val Brumby

Correspondence ID: 7688 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:36:07
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take

precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7689 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:36:11
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please do not allow off road vehicles on the Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 7690 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Ostrom, Gavin A
Received: May,07,2010 12:36:28
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
As a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7691 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Watson, John S
Received: May,07,2010 12:36:29
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please protect native wildlife by banning off-road vehicles in Cape Hatteras....

Correspondence ID: 7692 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:36:32
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I have visited Cape Hatteras on a number of occasions and enjoyed its beauty and tranquility tremendously. Please keep it like that and ban any off road vehicles from its pristine beaches.
I refuse to go there again if off road vehicles are allowed.

Correspondence ID: 7693 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Souza, Julie
Received: May,07,2010 12:36:41
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID:	7694	Project:	10641	Document:	32596
Name:	Andersson, Linda L				
Received:	May,07,2010 12:36:47				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	<p>I can't believe that these accidents, which the BP corporation is paying the media and Congress to down play and to stop talking about altogether, get such support for their sloppy work ethics and attempts to get out of being responsible for cleaning and paying for the clean up. My friends who live in the Hattera National Seashore area are devastated to know that their whole quality of life is being diminished because of the greed and profiteering that is affecting sea life, land and now air quality. The entire planet is being affected, so please take whatever steps you can take to heal the damage that is being done to the seashore.</p> <p>These are very sad times in the United States. We need strong people to stand for what is truly right. How can we explain these mistakes to future generations?</p>				
Correspondence ID:	7695	Project:	10641	Document:	32596
Name:	Little, Vicki L				
Received:	May,07,2010 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	<p>Dear Superintendent Murray,</p> <p>Below is the official letter from NPCA but my thoughts are more personal. Cape Hatteras is the US park that my family has enjoyed the most often. We have vacationed there many, many times throughout the years, the latest time being last Thanksgiving. My question is how does allowing off the road vehicles(OTRV) on the beaches improve the park or improve the experience of the average visitor? I dont understand allowing OTRV in any parks. They are noisy,polluting, and tear up the ground and ruin bird, turtle, etc habitat and nesting grounds. Over the years, I had maybe seen only one vehicle on the beach. But in November I saw several and that was pretty far "off-season." If I were a parent of small children, I would be especially leery of going to a beach where there were OTRV everywhere.</p> <p>As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. <p>Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.</p> <p>***** Thank you very much for taking the time to protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again!</p> <p>Sincerely, Vicki Little</p>				
Correspondence ID:	7696	Project:	10641	Document:	32596
Name:	N/A, N/A				
Received:	May,07,2010 12:37:05				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	ORVs destroy habitat and the environment. Keep them out!				
Correspondence ID:	7697	Project:	10641	Document:	32596
Name:	private				
Received:	May,07,2010 12:37:08				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	This is a stupid idea to have ORV on the beach. It will ruin the enviroiment doing untold damage not to mention the danger to the beach goes ... that is unless the people are no longer going to be able to go to the beach and swim... Please keep these ORV's off the beach... the beaches are there for everyone to enjoy not just some tiny part of the population...				
Correspondence ID:	7698	Project:	10641	Document:	32596
Name:	N/A, N/A				
Received:	May,07,2010 12:37:11				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Please keep off-road vehicles out of the park. They are destructive and a source of noise pollution for those who want to enjoy the natural environment.				
Correspondence ID:	7699	Project:	10641	Document:	32596
Name:	private				
Received:	May,07,2010 12:37:12				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	URGENT: DON'T LET OFF ROAD VEHICLES DOMINATE CAPE HATTERAS NATIONAL SEASHORE! Thank you.				
Correspondence ID:	7700	Project:	10641	Document:	32596
Name:	Markowitz, John C				
Received:	May,07,2010 12:37:14				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	<p>Dear Sir or Madam:</p> <p>I understand that the National Park Service (NPS) is about to approve an Off Road Vehicle management plan for Cape Hatteras National Seashore that</p>				

would disproportionately dedicate beach use to year-round ORV traffic at the expense of wildlife and pedestrians. This would be a desecration of our natural environment, akin to encouraging skimobile traffic at Yellowstone or driving in any of our National Parks. America has become far too concerned with the combustion engine in the last century, putting its glorious natural resources in peril. Let's keep Nature natural. Off Road Vehicle use should be carefully limited at Cape Hatteras and elsewhere in the Parks system. Please come up with a management plan that places greater emphasis on pedestrian access and wildlife management, especially with regard to endangered sea turtles and shorebirds, and less on noisy, polluting, environmentally damaging Off Road vehicles.

Correspondence ID: 7701 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I've attached a form letter that conveys my feelings but I would like to say when I spend money on a vacation it's to go to a beach (I live in the desert) and the last thing I want to see and hear is motors running and reckless individuals tearing up the beaches. I vacation on the sea shores for peace and tranquillity and to watch the wildlife. If I can get a glimpse of a dolphin or a whale, even better. Building sand castles is another favorite. Please don't allow Off Road Vehicles on the beaches. The beaches are an escape from vehicles and peace and CRV's do not mix. As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
- 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7702 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Rosenfield, Ralph R
Received: May,07,2010 12:37:28
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: My wife and I vacation on the Cape often. Friends of our have a home just north of the seashore. We love the quiet of the sea and the pristine nature of the beach. It is unacceptable to allow OFF ROAD VEHICLES to intrude on this area. Not only is it bad for the beach, the wildlife, and our safety. It runs counter to the long term interest of the Park and to the Seashore. I would hope that we can somehow keep from destroying this link with our natural history, and our american heritage.

Correspondence ID: 7703 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
- 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

***** Thank you very much for taking the time to protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again!

Sincerely,
Gary W Feemster

Correspondence ID: 7704 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Hoch, Elizabeth A
Received: May,07,2010 12:37:52
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please preserve this National Shoreline - we don't know some noisy all-terrain vehicles running everything.

Correspondence ID: 7705 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: Sopala, Laurence V
Received: May,07,2010 12:38:02
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I would like to post my dismay that you're planning to allow ATVs on National Park Service beaches at Cape Hatteras. I believe that the parks should be a place where we can have peace and quiet, and get away from the motorized activity and noise that surrounds us in our day to day lives. Please vote against this measure, and keep the beaches clean and quiet. Only police and park service vehicles should be on these beaches.

Correspondence ID: 7706 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: N/A, N/A
Received: May,07,2010 12:38:03
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: This happens on beaches all over the developing world and they are learning that it destroys their beaches. Surely we can learn from their mistakes!

Correspondence ID: 7707 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:38:09
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
I have in the past directly experienced this wonderful area, including by bicycle, and strongly recommend that the area be kept free of Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use.
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage ORV use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7708 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:38:26
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7709 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches.
All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points:
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7710 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Gintz, Aimee J
Received: May.07,2010 12:38:36
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I have been vacationing at the Outer Banks before there were million dollar beach houses lining the coast. It's an amazing place - a place of great PEACE. Can you only imagine laying out enjoying the sun/ocean and some person (talking or texting) on a phone, not paying attention, driving on the beach because some law allowed him to - runs you over!! That's what could potentially happen if this ruling passes. You are not able to ensure everyone's safety and off roading where people vacation is a stupid idea. Me and my family will continue to vacation in NC (particularly OBX). If this ORV plan passes it may limit my time in Cape Hatteras...And tourist dollars are in demand. Thank you for your time, Aimee

Correspondence ID: 7711 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May.07,2010 12:38:52
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7712 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May.07,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.
***** Thank you very much for taking the time to protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again!

Sincerely,
Rev. Joseph L Epperson

Correspondence ID: 7713 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Schueth, Steve
Received: May.07,2010 12:38:59
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird

watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7714 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:38:59
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7715 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: N/A, N/A
Received: May,07,2010 12:39:05
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft

plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7716 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Wilder, Dwain
Received: May,07,2010 12:39:13
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Off-road vehicle use is often destructive of the environment and of wildlife habitat. ORVs can also inhibit free use of the areas they share with other,

non-vehicular users. What wildlife wants to nest next to a roaring two-cycle engine that scoots by at any time? Who wants to picnic there or hike there? OVR owners have no place in the midst of such areas, and I hope you vote to exclude them. They are not intended for truly wild places. They do best in areas already brutalized beyond repair by other uses. Bicycles yes, two-cycle gasoline driven vehicles, no.

Correspondence ID: 7717 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:39:23
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft

plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
- 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Cape Hatteras National Seashore is one of the last "undeveloped" beaches within driving distance from our residence and our favorite destination. Please don't ruin it! Thank you.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID:	7718	Project:	10641	Document:	32596		
Name:	bullard, debbie I						
Received:	May,07,2010 12:39:26						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	there is too much of a disaster herading your way now, this isn't even a fun activity and the animals that live there need their space, as we humans do.						
Correspondence ID:	7719	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,07,2010 12:39:30						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	I fully support the banning of all vehicles on the Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The vehicles are an endangerment to wildlife and the environment. Please put the preservation of this precious, priceless National Park ahead of the special interest groups. As we've learned, once these natural resources are gone, they are gone forever. Don't let that happen.						
Correspondence ID:	7720	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,07,2010 12:39:31						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	Please consider the consequences of opening up your beautiful beaches for ORV use. Here in Utah an unquantifiable and unimaginable amount of damage has been done to our wild lands due to ORV use. Once an area is opened for ORV use, the area becomes less habitable for native plant and animal life. After dirt roads are formed they become paved roads and then "development" occurs. Quiet places in nature are getting harder to come by. Please preserve your open land for future generations to enjoy. Sincerely, J.D. Maret						
Correspondence ID:	7721	Project:	10641	Document:	32596		
Name:	meier, rich						
Received:	May,07,2010 12:39:33						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	The word "public" means for the public/general use. Not for one special group's use. We see this happening to our local parks, where organized corporate sports teams are taking over all the open spaces with astro turf, lighting, etc., etc. All at taxpayer expense. Now the "Public" can't walk their dogs, have picnics, or fly a kite because they will be in the way of the Special Ones. This is politics at the lowest levels. Leave public land alone. Not everyone will be happy if they can't drill oil or whatever on public land, but that's the point. No one person or group can dominate it, either. Get it? Obviously you don't. Or you don't care.						
Correspondence ID:	7722	Project:	10641	Document:	32596		
Name:	Fahy, Elizabeth						
Received:	May,07,2010 12:39:38						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.						

Correspondence ID:	7723	Project:	10641	Document:	32596		
Name:	Artin, Thomas						
Received:	May,07,2010 00:00:00						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	I urge you to adopt a modified Alternative D of the draft Environmental Impact Statement, protecting that which makes Cape Hatteras so special-- abundant (and endangered) wildlife and the natural quiet of miles of pristine Atlantic seashore.						
Correspondence ID:	7724	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,07,2010 00:00:00						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	Dear Superintendent Murray: As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the opportunity to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle ("ORV") use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore ("Seashore"). The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points: 1. The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2. When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Accordingly, Congress' intent was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and permit ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. 3. The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to comment. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.						
Correspondence ID:	7725	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,07,2010 00:00:00						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	Please stop allowing our environment and wildlife to be destroyed. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you...						
Correspondence ID:	7726	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,07,2010 12:39:52						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	With beach environments so fragile, the last thing needed are off road vehicles tearing up dunes and contributing to beach erosion. Many of these vehicles are designed to produce "maximum roar," thus disturbing visitors peace and quiet. ORV's have no place in this environment.						
Correspondence ID:	7727	Project:	10641	Document:	32596		
Name:	N/A, N/A						
Received:	May,07,2010 12:39:58						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	You're cooperation and support would be much appreciated.						
Correspondence ID:	7728	Project:	10641	Document:	32596		
Name:	Maddox, Charles E						
Received:	May,07,2010 12:40:03						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	My entire family is very strongly against permitting more Off Road Vehicle use in the Cape Hatteras National Seashore. I have watched over the years the alarming increase in the number of vehicles tearing up the beaches, making walking less safe, rendering the air foul with exhaust fumes, replacing the sounds of the ocean and birds with the roar of gunning engines and tearing up the habitat of creatures that need the space between the water's edge and dunes. In other words, ORVs are a highly destructive intrusion to the Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Please do not open the seashore to further ORV use. Keep gasoline engines on the paved roads not on the beaches. My family even urge you to stop it altogether. Sincerely,						

Charles Maddox

Correspondence ID: 7729 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.
Even apart from the environmental impact of ORVs, I can think of few things more likely to ruin a visit to this beautiful place, one for which the Old North State is known and of which we are justifiably proud, than seeing and hearing noisy ORVs and watching them leave tire tracks all over the place. The very idea depresses me more than I can say! Cape Hatteras National Seashore is meant to be a wilderness area. There are plenty of places ORV enthusiasts can go and make all the noise and fumes they want to, particularly their own PRIVATE PROPERTY. Please don't let this pristine area be ruined for visitors current and future. Please!!
Sincerely,
Tar Heel resident and taxpayer, Nancy C. Foster Greensboro, NC

Correspondence ID: 7730 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.
***** Thank you very much for taking the time to protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again!
Sincerely,
William Smith Cincinnati, Ohio

Correspondence ID: 7731 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

***** Thank you very much for taking the time to protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again!

Sincerely,
Lisa Lynch

Correspondence ID: 7732 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:40:26
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Off-road vehicles should not be admitted to ANY of our national parks! They are the toys of people who have no appreciation of the natural beauty around them and are just seeking the transient thrills of racing up and down difficult terrain. How can you officials be ignorant of the environmental destruction wrought by such machinery?? -- Especially in a sandy environment. Moving on from problems in destruction of the terrain -- what about all of the wildlife, much of it endangered and dependent upon specific limited ecosystems? What can you be thinking of?? Listen to the scientists and environmentalists and not to the corporations profiting from the sales of such "toys"!

Correspondence ID: 7733 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:40:37
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.
Sincerely,
Peter Laughlin

Correspondence ID: 7734 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Schneider, Allyn S
Received: May,07,2010 12:40:38
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: For the sake of wildlife please eliminate ORVs from Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 7735 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:40:41
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I don't want to smell your orv while I'm enjoying a natural environment. Things live under the sand and you will be killing them. I don't want to have to dodge traffic on the beach.

Correspondence ID: 7736 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:40:49
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: 7737 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:40:54
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: 7738 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:40:54
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I want to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Correspondence ID: 7739 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:40:59
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: 7740 **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, more than half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife.

ORV's take more than their fair share of resources when used. As a general guideline, I'd encourage a plan that pro-rates a particular usage profile based on its (negative) impact on the environment. Walking seems the least impact. Overnight stays would be next. And way up the list would be ORV usage. Consequently, I'd suggest only a small part of the 68 total miles would be appropriate for ORV use.

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: 7741 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 12:41:04

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: 7742 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 12:41:05

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: 7743 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 12:41:05

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As a resident of North Carolina and a frequent visitor to national parks and Cape Hatteras specifically, I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

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

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

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

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

Thank you for considering my comments.

Correspondence ID: 7744 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:41:05
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7745 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:41:10
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7746 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:41:10
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.

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

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

Correspondence ID: 7747 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:41:10
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please realize that I will be involved and I do read these details and do support the following!
I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Let North Carolina be a leader in preserving our wildlife!

Correspondence ID: 7748 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:41:10
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: 7749 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:41:10
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: 7750 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May.07,2010 12:41:11
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: 7751 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May.07,2010 12:41:11
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: 7752 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May.07,2010 12:41:16
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: 7753 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May.07,2010 12:41:17
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with

its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
- 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7754 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:41:21

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: 7755 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:41:21

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: 7756 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:41:21

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: 7757 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:41:21
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: 7758 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I believe the following statment fully expresses my feelings: The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.
Thank you for the opportunity to comment.
Robert D Tidwell

Correspondence ID: 7759 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Marshall, Robert T
Received: May,07,2010 12:41:26
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Protect the beach.

Correspondence ID: 7760 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:41:27
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: 7761 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:41:27
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: 7762 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:41:27
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: 7763 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:41:27
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: 7764 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:41:27
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: 7765 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May.07.2010 12:41:33
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: 7766 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May.07.2010 12:41:33
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: 7767 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May.07.2010 12:41:33
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:	7768	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	
Name:	Surmay, Lori M					
Received:	May,07,2010 12:41:36					
Correspondence Type:	Web Form					
Correspondence:	<p>Dear Superintendent Murray,</p> <p>As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.</p> <p>1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."</p> <p>2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.</p> <p>3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.</p> <p>Lori M. Surmay</p>					
Correspondence ID:	7769	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	
Name:	Baughman, Carol					
Received:	May,07,2010 12:41:38					
Correspondence Type:	Web Form					
Correspondence:	Please keep Cape Hatteras safe from abuses that could harm wildlife and the fragile ecosystem there. As a member of the NPCA, I hope to one day visit this special part of our Atlantic shoreline. Thankyou					
Correspondence ID:	7770	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private: Y
Name:	private					
Received:	May,07,2010 12:42:04					
Correspondence Type:	Web Form					
Correspondence:	<p>Dear Superintendent Murray,</p> <p>As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.</p> <p>1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."</p> <p>2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.</p> <p>3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.</p>					
Correspondence ID:	7771	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private: Y
Name:	private					
Received:	May,07,2010 12:42:07					
Correspondence Type:	Web Form					
Correspondence:	This noisy, brutal mayhem has got to stop. It has already damaged too many delicate natural areas.					
Correspondence ID:	7772	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private: Y
Name:	private					
Received:	May,07,2010 12:42:15					
Correspondence Type:	Web Form					
Correspondence:	<p>Dear Superintendent Murray,</p> <p>As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that</p>					

make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
- 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7773 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:42:18
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
 As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.
 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.
 Sincerely, Mark Hotchkiss

Correspondence ID: 7774 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Mueller, Sally C
Received: May,07,2010 12:42:22
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I love that seashore and have enjoyed vacationing there with my family, who grew up to love it,too. Please do not allow ORV to desecrate our beloved National Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 7775 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
 As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.
 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.
 ***** Thank you very much for taking the time to protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today.
 Brgds,
 Rick Roberson 832-368-1065

Correspondence ID: 7776 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:42:36
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please keep as much of the seashore off limits to humans as possible. Animals and plants were here first, and we need them to maintain the Outer Banks. I personally loathe Off-Road Vehicles.

Correspondence ID: 7777 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Hassett, Todd
Received: May,07,2010 12:42:40
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7778 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:42:51
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: No off-road vehicles! Keep the Cape quiet and clean! It would be a disgrace to do otherwise.

Correspondence ID: 7779 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Berg, Peter
Received: May,07,2010 12:42:55
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7780 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: N/A, N/A
Received: May,07,2010 12:43:09
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID:	7781	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	
Name:	Kowalewski, Douglas					
Received:	May,07,2010 12:43:19					
Correspondence Type:	Web Form					
Correspondence:	I thought your department was supposed to protect public spaces. Why are you even considering allowing off road vehicles on the Cape Hatteras National Seashore??? These vehicles will do nothing except ruin fragile eco-systems. They have always been banned because they are horribly destructive, disturb everybody and everything, and are only used by a tiny minority of people. Use common sense. Do not allow these things!!!!					
Correspondence ID:	7782	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	
Name:	McCarty, Natasha R					
Received:	May,07,2010 12:43:19					
Correspondence Type:	Web Form					
Correspondence:	Stop!!!					
Correspondence ID:	7783	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	
Name:	Olander, Alan					
Received:	May,07,2010 12:43:37					
Correspondence Type:	Web Form					
Correspondence:	Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan. Sincerely, Alan Olander					
Correspondence ID:	7784	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private: Y
Name:	private					
Received:	May,07,2010 12:43:40					
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, MY family and MY friends as well as most Americans who only wish to enjoy America's NATURAL beauty and not the man-made ones. We have too many places for those already. What's next...NASCAR on the beaches? The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for ALL Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does NOT represent a FAIR BALANCE for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources FIRST. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.					
Correspondence ID:	7785	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private: Y
Name:	private					
Received:	May,07,2010 12:43:40					
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: 7786 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:43:40
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: 7787 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:43:40
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: 7788 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:43:40
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: 7789 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:43:40
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: 7790 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:43:49
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: 7791 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:43:49
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: 7792 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:43:49
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: 7793 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:43:49
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. A valuable rule in all decision making is first "Do no harm".

Correspondence ID: 7794 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:43:49
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: 7795 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:43:55
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I have returned to areas that were once pristine and now are ruined by off road vehicles in every way that pollutes. The Gulf BP oil spill should also be teaching us to preserve these precious lands, as there are fewer left now.

Correspondence ID: 7796 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:43:55
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: 7797 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:43:55
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: 7798 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:43:56
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: 7799 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: N/A, N/A
Received: May,07,2010 12:43:58
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: No! No! No!

Correspondence ID: 7800 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:44:01
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: It is dangerous having vehicals with beachgoers, and offroad vehicals leak toxic fluids.

Correspondence ID: 7801 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:44:01
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I visit Hatteras often in my 4WD, and enjoy driving on the beaches. But what I go to the Outer Banks for is the unspoiled, open beaches and wildlife. I would gladly give up my drives on the sand if it meant the beach would not become a thoroughfare with animal and bird carcasses. Please do not expand any off-road driving privileges on these beautiful islands. You know that people will always abuse the laws and I fear for the fragile ecosystem.

Correspondence ID: 7802 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: N/A, Adriana
Received: May,07,2010 12:44:11
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Most people go to a beach to relax and enjoy the sound of the ocean's waves, not to hear the obnoxious rumble of ORVs.
Aside from the noise issue, there are safety and environmental issues to consider as well.
With ORVs allowed to buzz across a beach, there is the risk and liability of injuries to those trying to enjoy the beach, and to the ORV drivers and/or riders themselves. That, along with the contaminants that ORVs will leave on the beach (oil, , fuel, tire fragments, etc.), will ruin the beach for not only people, but for the native inhabitants as well - the animals and sea life that reside there.
Please do not allow ORVs on the beach!

Correspondence ID: 7803 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:44:14
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I remember visiting Cape Hatteras as a child. We drove from Kentucky to play on the beaches and visit the lighthouse. Please keep the shore clean so that future generations can visit and have the same memories as I do... There's no need to tear up such a beautiful place for off-roaders. There are plenty of places for ATV and off-roading, but very few places as special as Cape Hatteras.
Thanks! Mary Hawkins

Correspondence ID: 7804 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Meisner, Lora
Received: May,07,2010 12:44:14
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all

visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Personally, I think the idea of ANY vehicle other than a bicycle should not be allowed near any beach or sand dunes on the North Carolina coast.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7805 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: smith, ian
Received: May,07,2010 12:44:21
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: do not let our beaches be ruined by traffic.

Correspondence ID: 7806 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:44:22
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Cape Hatteras National Seashore will be dominated by ORV use for the next 20 years if people let it happen. I am totally opposed to this. I would like a management plan that places greater emphasis on pedestrian access and wildlife management, especially with regard to endangered sea turtles and shorebirds and other wildlife. It is necessary to keep the environment in its natural state so that people and animals alike can enjoy and live with nature without interference from ORV use or from any other kind of destruction.

Correspondence ID: 7807 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:44:32
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7808 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:44:34
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Last year was our first trip to the Outer Banks, and what a treasure. We should reduce the footprint of this area as much as possible, so that it will maintain its eco balance for years to come.
There are enough area to ride ATVs in the united states.
Thank you for your consideration.

Correspondence ID: 7809 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: N/A, N/A
Received: May,07,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7810 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Albano, Louis G
Received: May,07,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.
***** Thank you very much for taking the time to protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again!
Sincerely,
Louis GT. Albano

Correspondence ID: 7811 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Lima, Paul
Received: May,07,2010 12:44:52
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I urge strict limits on ORV use. The noise, pollution and destruction of flora and fauna must not be permitted to continue.

Correspondence ID: 7812 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Norquist, Raun
Received: May,07,2010 12:44:59
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please consider the damage done to sandy beaches by allowing the use of ATVs not to mention the noise and disruption to wildlife. There are many places to tear up with off the road vehicles. In this world of turmoil can't we have a little peace, us and the creatures?

Correspondence ID: 7813 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:44:59
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7814 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:45:08
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft

plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
- 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Sincerely,
Jillian Forschner

Correspondence ID: 7815 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:45:09
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Based on my experience of with living with access to both a national wildlife refuge and a national seashore, I wish to express with all the force at my command my opposition to expanding their use by any form of vehicular traffic. Even the limited vehicular access here, fills the beach with ruts making walking very difficult. Though I am not longer to walk the beach as I once did and realize that expanded vehicular access might enable me to get me back on it, I prefer that the beach keep its untrampled character. No! to the plan under consideration>
John David spangler

Correspondence ID: 7816 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Rowan, Thomas J
Received: May,07,2010 12:45:13
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear NPS,
I and my family have been visiting the Outer Banks for many years. One favorite things is to go to the Cape Hatteras National Seashore because of its being maintained in the wild and one can appreciate the land and the sea before we ever walked on planet earth. There is a certain calm at the National Seashore that allows one to listen for the sound of birds and the crash of the surf.
I am writing to express my opposition to the National Park Service opening the National Seashore to Off Road Vehicles. Even though it is being proposed as an ORV management plan, once they are allowed it will be difficult to police and keep them from going off the road, across dunes, and causing untold damage to flora and fauna.
If it does come to pass that this ORV management plan is approved it will signal the end of our trips to the Outer Banks. I cannot understand how such a proposal can even be considered for a National Park. Please work to preserve the national parks and not destroy them through ORV's having the run of the park.
Sincerely,
Thomas J. Rowan

Correspondence ID: 7817 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.
PLEASE adopt a modified Alternative D of the draft Environmental Impact Statement, protecting what which makes Cape Hatteras so very special--the abundant wildlife and miles of quiet pristine Atlantic seashore. It's time we take care of what GOD gave us and not ruin our precious land and seashore!
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7818 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Norkus, Edward
Received: May,07,2010 12:45:26
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Looking to the future and hoping that my grandchildren will be able to see, enjoy and appreciate wilderness areas and the past that they represent I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7819 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Carter, Pat
Received: May,07,2010 12:45:26
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: What is it about your job description that you don't understand? You were hired to protect and preserve our national treasures and these include beaches, as well as the ocean and wild or semi-wild environments.
Off-road vehicles have a long history of destruction and mayhem in our National Forests, deserts and Parks. Don't let them further destroy our beaches!
Off-road vehicles, including ATVs, snowmobiles etc. are poison for the wild lands.
Please start protecting our national lands instead of contributing to their destruction.
Thank you,
A mother and grandmother who cares!

Correspondence ID: 7820 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Tarr, Richard
Received: May,07,2010 12:45:39
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Thank God, the Bush administration is gone. This type of policy decision-making needs to go away, hopefully forever. These parks are held in trust for America. They can no longer be thrown away for the economic benefit of a few greedy exploiters.

Correspondence ID: 7821 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Harris, Ann S
Received: May,07,2010 12:45:40
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear National Park Service:
If the experts in the various environmental organizations to which I belong, then I am too. OTV vehicles are not associated with quiet, careful exploration of sensitive natural environments. On the contrary, I can only imagine a lot of teenagers racing along the sea shoe and destroying everything in their path. I hope that you will not allow this to happen to the shore at Cape Hatteras.
Ann S. Harris, PhD

Correspondence ID: 7822 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
Thanks for reading this comment.
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.
***** Thank you very much for taking the time to protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again!
Sincerely,
Kirk Francis.

Correspondence ID: 7823 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: pierce, patrick g
Received: May,07,2010 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence:

Sirs, thank you for the opportunity to comment on this important deliberation. As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association Cape Hatteras is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Clearly, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. ORV usage is inimical to wildlife and antithetical to the serene engagement with nature that parks and national seashores should engender. sincerely, patrick pierce

Correspondence ID: 7824 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: Charland, Chadd C

Received: May.07.2010 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence:

As a longtime donor to the National Park Foundation and someone deeply concerned about their future, I want you to limit as much as possible the use of Off Road Vehicles in the parks - including Cape Hatteras - as much as possible. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

Thank you, Chadd Charland

Correspondence ID: 7825 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May.07.2010 12:45:46

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence:

I'm for leaving the wild areas wild.

Correspondence ID: 7826 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May.07.2010 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence:

Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
- 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

***** Thank you very much for taking the time to protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again!

Sincerely,
Margaret McGinley

Correspondence ID: 7827 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May.07.2010 12:45:54

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence:

Dear Superintendent Murray,

When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." The intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. However, experience has also showed us that it is IMPOSSIBLE to protect scenic areas if you allow ORV use. ORV use and fragile, scenic, and QUIET places such as this cannot exist together. ORV use destroys the land, and causes noise and air pollution. You simply CANNOT allow use of ORV's on areas that are supposed to be protected by the National Park Service.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7828 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Stadnik, George
Received: May,07,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence:

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
- 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Correspondence ID: 7829 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: N/A, N/A
Received: May,07,2010 12:45:59
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence:

Dear Superintendent Murray,
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
- 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7830 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Duckworth, Ron
Received: May,07,2010 12:46:03
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence:

Dear Superintendent Murray,
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
- 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7831 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: N/A, N/A
Received: May,07,2010 12:46:06
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence:

Dear Superintendent Murray,
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft

plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

***** Thank you very much for taking the time to protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again!

Correspondence ID: 7832 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: Vasily, Karen

Received: May,07,2010 12:46:06

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Sincerely, Karen L. Vasily

Correspondence ID: 7833 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 12:46:13

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7834 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: Stutes, Earl A

Received: May,07,2010 12:46:15

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am sure the use of off road vehicles on these precious public beaches is fun for the rider folks, but I call into question the long term damage that can be caused by them. I believe Off-Road vehicles should not be allowed to tear up our precious national treasures.

Correspondence ID: 7835 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: N/A, Wanda

Received: May,07,2010 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

I have lived close to Galveston beaches here in Texas for almost 20 years. Besides being a polluted abomination peppered with tar balls, a lot of the beaches are open to vehicles. It's ugly and people don't seem to respect the land when they're in a vehicle. Whether it's on-road or off-road vehicles, their use encourages reckless behavior and disregard for wildlife and pedestrians. Those of us who have spent time on peaceful expanse of unpolluted Carolina beaches can only feel shame at what we are capable of turning it into. Don't start down the road of letting the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore turn into what's happened here.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7836 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 12:46:22

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Sincerely,
Audrey Marques

Correspondence ID: 7837 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: Reisman, Emil

Received: May,07,2010 12:46:27

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: off road activities do not allow other beach uses - the beaches belong to all

Correspondence ID: 7838 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: N/A, N/A

Received: May,07,2010 12:46:43

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: please, care for the planet

Correspondence ID: 7839 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: wick, jodi L

Received: May,07,2010 12:46:49

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take

precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7840 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:46:53

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: To whom it may concern:

As an avid beach walker, I would be incredibly upset if I had to deal with ATV's and other such vehicles racing around and disturbing the natural environment around me. It would most likely cause me to find another beach to visit. I understand that there is a desperate need to increase the funding for our national parks, however if we do so at the expense of the parks themselves, eventually it will have been pointless for the parks will have been ruined. Not only will the people visiting be disturbed, but the animals will be driven away by the sound and actions of off road vehicles. Please try to keep in mind that while some people who enjoy using ATV type vehicles have respect for the environment, many find entertainment in chasing down animals and hunting. These are not the types of activities that should be permitted inside a national park.

Sincerely, Mandi Adkins

Correspondence ID: 7841 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: kuligowski, rebecca a
Received: May,07,2010 12:46:58

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As a species, we are busy using up what our planet could have sustained for centuries and from which it may have rebounded, were we not so busy chewing it up.

We are the destructive force that will bring it all down and we don't seem to care as long as we can have that man made stuff called money, that we can't eat and won't sustain life of a kind.

When will we be smart enough to realize that: GOD gave us one planet to live on and we have abused that gift. GOD may have had a plan but we've trampled it for sure.

Please don't let motor vehicles destroy that beautiful shore. Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 7842 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:46:59

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: i am numb with anger that hundreds of applications to drill for oil are given exemptions! please fight for the country and environment and population that these representatives/legislators, are supposed to protect. i don't know how they live with themselves! in the meantime, peoples' livelihoods,homes, etc. are wiped out!

Correspondence ID: 7843 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:47:08

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: We should be working to protect our environmental park areas and not allow them to be open to ORVs as this will destroy both the beaches and the wildlife that live near them. There has already been much too much destruction of our parklands during the previous administration and I am hopeful that this administration will take steps to increase the protection of these wildlife areas and naturally beautiful beaches and not allow these vehicles to destroy them! Thank you for doing all that you can do to protect these beautiful areas of our incredible country!

Correspondence ID: 7844 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: N/A, N/A
Received: May,07,2010 12:47:11

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Sincerely, Bill Wilson

Correspondence ID:	7845	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,07,2010 12:47:16						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	Please restrict ORV use as much as possible at Cape Hatteras and elsewhere. As a hiker and outdoors person, I have been continually shocked and horrified by the damage and noise created by ORV users, who seem determined to use not only their designated areas but anywhere else as well. One vehicle can be heard for an enormous distance, spoiling the experience for everyone, and trails become rutted, scarred, and unusable. The person on foot is always a little bit on guard, waiting for a vehicle to suddenly appear behind them. Birds and other wildlife flee the noise and exhaust smells.						
Correspondence ID:	7846	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,07,2010 12:47:19						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	There must be other places where off-road-vehicle owners can ride without endangering wildlife and the natural beauty of the landscape! I hope this is not another instance of government kowtowing to business and lobbying pressure at the expense of habitat. Bob Doles						
Correspondence ID:	7847	Project:	10641	Document:	32596		
Name:	N/A, N/A						
Received:	May,07,2010 00:00:00						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	<p>Dear Superintendent Murray,</p> <p>You have the power to make a difference!</p> <p>As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. <p>Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.</p> <p>***** Thank you very much for taking the time to protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again!</p> <p>Sincerely, Jill Herbers</p>						
Correspondence ID:	7848	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,07,2010 12:47:46						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	Have you seen what recreational vehicles have done to the sand dunes in the Upper Peninsula of Michigan? Take a look. They have since banned traffic in the park but the damage has already been done.						
Correspondence ID:	7849	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,07,2010 12:47:46						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	Please keep beaches quiet and beautiful. Any type of motorized vehicles spoil the atmosphere and safety for those who are walking and enjoying our valuable NATURAL resources. The noise and fumes of any type of vehicle do not benefit our environment. We must encourage people to respect the gifts of our beaches. Please!!!						
Correspondence ID:	7850	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,07,2010 12:47:50						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	<p>Off road vehicles - 4 wheelers, dune buggy's etc.. Unless used by an individual person who is Handi-capped and can only enjoy this place using this type of vehicle should not be allowed.</p> <p>These off road vehicles create erosion control damage with the ruts created. The flora / fauna is beat down to the ground and will not grow back. Not everyone cares that the land is altered by these machines - not everyone is careless - but some are dangerous.</p> <p>Ideally - the States if they are going to take fees for registrations they should provide them a legal place to ride - a safe place.</p> <p>You can't mix walking traffic with off road traffic or horses.</p> <p>Good luck! From an x-owner of a 4 wheeler - I sold because of the other dangerous drivers.</p>						
Correspondence ID:	7851	Project:	10641	Document:	32596		
Name:	Carlson, Alan L						
Received:	May,07,2010 12:47:52						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	<p>Dear Superintendent Murray,</p> <p>As a long-time member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments</p>						

on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
- 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.
Sincerely, Alan Carlson

Correspondence ID: 7852 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Hathaway, Susan
Received: May,07,2010 12:48:05
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
- 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7853 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:48:06
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I believe allowing off-road vehicles on the beaches of Cape Hatteras would be destructive and irresponsible. Their use causes soil erosion, noise pollution, and the general loss of natural animal habitat. I have lived in the country on the water my entire life and speak from experience. Please keep our last peaceful, wild places the way they were ment to be...protected.

Correspondence ID: 7854 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
- 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

ORVs do so much damage to any area that they travel over, except maybe very rocky areas. That beautiful sandy beach would be destroyed by those machines.

There needs to be places of peace and quiet for both humans and wild life. Please do all that you can to preserve this valuable area.

***** Thank you very much for taking the time to protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea

turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again!
Sincerely, Joanne Hesselink

Correspondence ID:	7855	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	
Name:	Markgraf, Steven					
Received:	May,07,2010 12:48:14					
Correspondence Type:	Web Form					
Correspondence:	<p>Dear Superintendent Murray,</p> <p>As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.</p> <p>1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."</p> <p>2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.</p> <p>3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.</p>					
Correspondence ID:	7856	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private: Y
Name:	private					
Received:	May,07,2010 12:48:24					
Correspondence Type:	Web Form					
Correspondence:	Part of the wonderful beauty of Cape Hatteras National Seashore is its unspoiled naturalness. ORV would make it become a noisy degraded playground probably strewn with rubbish. Please don't sacrifice unspoiled nature.					
Correspondence ID:	7857	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private: Y
Name:	private					
Received:	May,07,2010 12:48:25					
Correspondence Type:	Web Form					
Correspondence:	<p>Please adopt a modified Alternative D proposal of the draft EIS.</p> <p>Don't let off road vehicles kill dominate this park. That's insane. Off-road vehicles REALLY have NO place in a park that is supposed to preserve the wonder of the natural world. They are purely destructive. Especially when endangered species are involved, that nest on the beach!</p> <p>Thank you, Bryan Tarbox</p>					
Correspondence ID:	7858	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	
Name:	N/A, N/A					
Received:	May,07,2010 12:48:33					
Correspondence Type:	Web Form					
Correspondence:	I would like to see stringent controls on ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. If they have to be allowed at all they need very strict controls to minimize damage to nesting birds and plant life. It is unfortunate that we have a populace that values ORV recreation as it is environmentally destructive and not conducive to the quiet and peacefulness I desire when visiting the beach. Certainly the life forms that need an undisturbed home do not appreciate ORV molestation.					
Correspondence ID:	7859	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	
Name:	Crawford, Gayle					
Received:	May,07,2010 12:48:33					
Correspondence Type:	Web Form					
Correspondence:	We're having enough trouble with oil in the Gulf. Lets not destroy yet another ecosystem just so off road vehicle junkies can get their jollies.					
Correspondence ID:	7860	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	
Name:	Baker, Richard G					
Received:	May,07,2010 12:48:36					
Correspondence Type:	Web Form					
Correspondence:	<p>Dear Superintendent Murray,</p> <p>As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.</p> <p>1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."</p> <p>2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.</p>					

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7861 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Blackshear, Sherry
Received: May,07,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

We live near Lake Grapevine & it took many years for our shore line & wildlife to recover from the effects of off road vehicles use. Their presences made the shore line a noisy, dangerous place to be for people & wildlife, not to mention the mountains of trash left every weekend.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Thank you very much for taking the time to protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again!

Sincerely, Sherry Blackshear

Correspondence ID: 7862 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Graver, Chuck E
Received: May,07,2010 12:48:48
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7863 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Tylanda, Elton W
Received: May,07,2010 12:48:52
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: If you're smarter than a president Reagan (aka the "amiable dunce") or George Bush (aka "the village idiot") and more scrupulous than an "I'm no crook" Nixon and more courageous than "political cowards" like the Clintons, I'm sure you'll consider the environment and the future of our children over short term profits and political expediency.

Correspondence ID: 7864 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all

visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

I know we live in a mechanized world and many people like to go fast and make a lot of noise, but must only those people be given preferential treatment in all of our natural and wild areas? Please leave this beautiful and fragile park as a safe haven for wildlife and people who are refreshed by the soothing of the waves, the cries of birds, and the opportunity to renew our connection with the earth in peace.

Thank you very much for taking the time to protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again!

Sincerely,

Anne Eversoll Murphy, North Carolina 28906

Correspondence ID: 7865 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:48:58
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please, no Off Road Vehicles on the Cape Hatteras National Seashore.
 Don't let self centered humans spoil our beaches and destroy wildlife.

Correspondence ID: 7866 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
 As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.
 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."
 Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.
 ***** Thank you very much for taking the time to protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again!
 Sincerely,
 Roberta Belulovich

Correspondence ID: 7867 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: N/A, N/A
Received: May,07,2010 12:49:12
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
 As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.
 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."
 Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7868 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: Wechsler, Susan
Received: May,07,2010 12:49:15
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7869 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Roberts, Barry W
Received: May,07,2010 12:49:29
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Someone has to care

Correspondence ID: 7870 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:49:30
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7871 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Targon, Elvira M
Received: May,07,2010 12:49:36
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Keep all vehicles off the beaches. Preserve the delicate balance of nature as much as possible.

Correspondence ID: 7872 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:49:41
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: To Whom It May Concern,

I've become aware that the NPS is considering allowing off road vehicles on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. I strongly oppose this.

I have been visiting Cape Hatteras my entire life and make several trips there a year. I love it because it offers a glimpse of the unique landscape of North Carolina's Outer Banks in its relatively pristine, untouched state. The Outer Banks are quickly losing many of their natural treasures and Cape Hatteras is a small preserve of that wild, completely unique landscape.

I feel off road vehicles would greatly degrade Cape Hatteras. Noise alone would harm the appeal of the shore. But the vehicles would likely have a much harsher environmental impact. I'm sure fragile sand dunes, migratory bird and turtle nesting sites, and protected sea oats would quickly fall victim to joyriders. Not to mention the smell of exhaust fumes on the normally aromatic sea breeze.

I understand many people enjoy riding off road vehicles, but many others enjoy Cape Hatteras for its natural beauty. I know my family and I love it for its untouched state and many bird watchers and photographers do as well. The attraction of an undeveloped seashore brings money to the area and preserves part of the unique Outer Banks' ecosystem.

There are so few undeveloped beaches in this country, please leave this one unharmed. It is a special place that my family and I love and it is worth keeping as it is. Thank you.

Sincerely, Alex Vactor

0011061

Correspondence ID: 7873 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Ebershoff-Coles, Susan
Received: May,07,2010 12:49:43
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Pleasestrictly limit or, even better, prohibit the use ORVs, ATMs and all other motorized vehicals from all our beaches. The damage they do we cannot allow. They are nosiy, dirty, and too often driven by people who don't care about other people, wildlife, plant life, or the damage they are doing to the ecology of the beaches. They will not stop on their own so laws are needed to prevent misuse and distruction of irreplaceable wild places. Our environment is under huge pressure from every direction and it is important that the parks department protect all its area from those who would destroy it.
Please do not open any beach anywhere to motorized vehicles of any kind.
Thank you

Correspondence ID: 7874 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:50:06
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
As an avid appreciator of our American landscape and as a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.
Sincerely, Pat Egleston

Correspondence ID: 7875 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: VAN_WAGNEN, HEIDI
Received: May,07,2010 12:50:10
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: CAPE HATTERAS AND ALL OF OUR NATION'S BEACHES ARE THE EASTERN, SOUTHERN AND WESTERN CRUST OF OUR NATION---
--YES, THE CRUST OF OUR NATION !!!!! ISN'T THAT WORTH KEEPING PURE FOR PEDESTRIANS AND WILDLIFE TO LIVE ON AND ENJOY. IF WE MUDDY-UP THE SALTY OCEAN'S PATH WHAT WILL REMAIN PRISTINE, AS CAPE HATTERAS IS NOW. I CAN'T BELIEVE ANY SANE POLITICIAN WOULD CHOOSE TO POLLUTE THE CAPE HATTERAS BEACH WITH OIL, TIRE TRACKS, EMISSIONS DISCHARGE AND PUT PEDESTRIANS AND OUR NATIONAL SEASIDE WILDLIFE IN DANGER. THERE MUST BE MONEY AT STAKE HERE. ARE WE TO SELL OUR MIGHTY BEACHES AND ALL OUR BEAUTIFUL WILDERNESS' FOR THE SAKE OF THE MONEY. WHERE DOES IT BEGIN---CAPE HATTERAS? AND WHERE DOES IT END? WHO WILL BENEFIT IN THE BEGINNING OF IT'S DESTRUCTION.
HEIDI SHAY VAN WAGNEN

Correspondence ID: 7876 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Miner, Samuel
Received: May,07,2010 12:50:12
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: THE WILDERNESS IS A PLACE OF ESCAPE AND CLARITY.
THE WILDERNESS DOES SO MUCH TO HELP ME AND MY FRIENDS RECONNECT WITH NATURE. IT HAS A POSITIVE EFFECT ON OUR LIVES. WE HAVE FUN, WE RELAX, WE ADVENTURE.
THE WILD SHOULD STAY WILD. IT IS OUR DUTY TO THE PAST AND PRESENT GENERATIONS TO PRESERVE THE NATURAL WORLD.
I APPRECIATE YOUR CONSIDERATION SAMUEL MINER, FRIENDS AND FAMILY

Correspondence ID: 7877 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Decker, Mary Gail
Received: May,07,2010 12:50:13
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: With the recent disaster in the Gulf, beach use should not be open to Off-Road Vehicles at all. What wild animals we have left should be protected. Isn't that what God would want us to do for his creatures?

Correspondence ID: 7878 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: McGuire, Tim M
Received: May,07,2010 12:50:17
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I would not consider visiting a seashore that allows off road vehicles on it's beaches. Pedestrian visitors and wildlife / environmental imapact should be the primary concerns of the NPS at Cape Hatteras national Seashore. ORV use in primitive wilderness areas should not be allowed. The reason Cape Hatteras is a park is because of it's natural beauty. ORV use will damage that natural beauty for present and future generations to enjoy should they be given access to what was established as a primitive wilderness area. The noise alone would ruin the natural serenity of the Cape and the damage caused by leaking oil / gas and fumes would be equally as bad. But worst would be the impact of wheels on the landscape and plants. Those who ride ORV's for recreation do not ride them to stay on designated trails or roads. They like to test the off road capabilities of their vehicles. A national treasure like Cape

Hatteras is not a place for such vehicles.
 Thanks you for listening and considering my comments.
 Tim McGuire

Correspondence ID: 7879 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May.07,2010 12:50:21
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: As an avid user of our National Parks, I treasure them as a place, not just of beauty, but also tranquility. Most U.S. citizens spend their lives bombarded by noise --- in our cities, restaurants, places of employment, even our city parks. The experience of solitude and the ability to hear the sounds of nature clearly are getting more and more difficult to find ANYWHERE other than in our National Parks.
 I encourage you to strictly limit the use of ATV's at Cape Hatteras and America's other National Parks. I am writing from an area that is currently developing lands heavily damaged due to strip mining as ATV recreation areas. Although it pains me to say it, these lands, which can never be sufficiently reclaimed, are a more suitable place for ATV activity.
 I am looking to the National Park Service to preserve some ability for Americans to escape the barrage of noise that is now a part of everyday life. Please don't let us down.
 Sincerely,
 Patricia L. Hudson 3507 Kesterwood Drive Knoxville, TN 37918

Correspondence ID: 7880 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May.07,2010 12:50:32
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: NO, NO, NO, NO! Not a good policy to let a small percentage of the population take over a whole location. Once motorized vehicles are allowed, all other forms recreation will leave. Sort of like if you allow ski boats on a lake, the canoes, kayaks and sailboats leave. Not a good policy. I own a 4x4 and do a lot of OHV, but in a proper manner, in designated areas.

Correspondence ID: 7881 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Michalowski, Joe D
Received: May.07,2010 12:50:46
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
 As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.
 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."
 Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.
 Sincerely, Joe Michalowski

Correspondence ID: 7882 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May.07,2010 12:50:58
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
 As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.
 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."
 Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.
 Thank you!

Correspondence ID: 7883 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:51:09
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
 As a supporter of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.
 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."
 Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7884 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:51:18
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
 As an action member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.
 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."
 Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7885 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:51:30
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: We need a clean environment.

Correspondence ID: 7886 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: Arth, David a
Received: May,07,2010 12:51:48
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: We are surrounded every single day with motor vehicles and breath their emissions. The last thing we need is to allow off road vehicles on this preserved beach. Take some time to think this out for the future of this planet that is already swimming in oil spills and choked with carbon dioxide. The planet will thank you and you can die knowing you helped.

Correspondence ID: 7887 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:51:48
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
 As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.
 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Thanks, Jinx

Correspondence ID: 7888 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Johnston, Catherine
Received: May.07.2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Greetings Superintendent Murray,
Thank you for offering the chance to provide comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicles at the Cape Hatteras National Seashore. As you know this is a very beautiful area that is significant to vacationers and bird watchers, as well as those who just appreciate the lack of development in the area.
I am concerned about the environmental impact of the plans that seem to favor Off Road Vehicles to the detriment of other park visitors as well as the wildlife and scenic opportunities that the area allows. For this reason I would support Alternative D if it could be modified to recognize and include the following:
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.
Thank you very much for the opportunity to provide these comments and for taking the time to sort these out. I truly appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.
Cordially yours, Catherine Johnston

Correspondence ID: 7889 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May.07.2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.
***** Thank you very much for taking the time to protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again!
Sincerely, Scott Fanok

Correspondence ID: 7890 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May.07.2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the

pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Thank you very much for taking the time to protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again!

Sincerely, Angela Curran Northfield, MN

Correspondence ID: 7891 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: Fredrickson, John

Received: May,07,2010 12:52:01

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7892 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 12:52:09

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please keep ORVs off the Cape Hatteras beaches. There are certainly plenty of other areas where these people and their noisy, destructive toys can make a mess. Beach areas should be for foot traffic and be areas of undisturbed quiet away from vehicular traffic. Also these areas need to be protected for the wildlife that need this as a breeding area. We need to protect plant life also. Man has already harmed the Earth too much. We are combating a large oil eruption in the Gulf caused by man's greediness and lack of regulation of corporations. Please keep these ORVs out of this area. Thanks. The world is watching!

Correspondence ID: 7893 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: Shiebler, Chuck

Received: May,07,2010 12:52:17

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7894 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: N/A, N/A

Received: May,07,2010 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. As a child, my family would vacation in Cape Hatteras and I remember many hours just walking the beach with my family, picking up shells, swimming, looking at the sea birds and to have that peace and serenity changed would be devastating. The last time that I

was on the Outer Banks, I unknowingly went to a beach to do the same only to find that it was a beach that allowed vehicles. As a pedestrian, I felt unsafe and not peaceful whatsoever. Vehicles really impact and promote erosion of the beachfront and make it uninhabitable for the animals that would naturally be there. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

***** Thank you very much for taking the time to protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again!

Sincerely, Lizabeth Moniz

Correspondence ID: 7895 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Black, Angela
Received: May,07,2010 12:52:22
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I urge you to adopt a modified Alternative D of the draft Environmental Impact Statement, protecting that which makes Cape Hatteras so special--abundant (and endangered) wildlife and the natural quiet of miles of pristine Atlantic seashore.

Correspondence ID: 7896 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:52:30
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please eliminate any private vehicles from the beaches. I object to the noise, pollution/exhaust odor and beach erosion these vehicles can cause. In addition they disturb the shorebird feeding patterns. Because a person buys a vehicle and especially an offroad type vehicle it does not give them the right to ride it wherever they want. Our natural resources are being abused enough already please help preserve what remains. Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 7897 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: THAMES, JOEL E
Received: May,07,2010 12:52:32
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Do we really need gas operated motor vehicles (ORVs) speeding around and endangering lives on Cape Hatteras? Did I mention the noise and the pollution? What are you thinking?

Correspondence ID: 7898 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement give precedence to ORV use over all other visitors. Here in Alaska, we can clearly see the detrimental effects of unmanaged ORV (ATV) use in the wetlands, and on the tundra. There is no such thing as low-impact when it comes to the use of off-road vehicles. They leave marks. They scar the land. Overall, your approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.
Sincerely, Cari Sayre and Dave Johnston Talkeetna, Alaska

Correspondence ID: 7899 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:52:35
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please limit off road vehicle access to Cape hatteras (and all national park beaches) to permit us to enjoy the quiet of nature and to prevent erosion of a precious resource.

Correspondence ID: 7900 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: N/A, N/A
Received: May,07,2010 12:52:37
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7901 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Grubb, Karen Y
Received: May,07,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,

I grew up vacationing on the Outer Banks of North Carolina. My grandmother grew up in nearby communities and my mother was raised in Elizabeth City. Every summer of my youth, we spent a week or two in the Outer Banks. I have especially fond memories of the pristine national seashore. I am horrified at the thought that this beach will disproportionately dedicate beach use to year-round ORV traffic at the expense of wildlife and pedestrian visitors. Please protect wildlife and the serenity of the beaches.

As a member of the Sierra Club and National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7902 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:52:44
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7903 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Wingo, Kaylyn

Received: May,07,2010 12:52:45

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7904 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

In a nutshell, I'm against allowing ORVs use of the area. A few reasons are: ORVs do damage to the terrain, they pollute (noise and airborne pollutants), and they are disruptive to those who want to "get away from it all."

The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7905 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 12:52:53

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,

Our national parks are for everyone - and for the wildlife that live there.

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7906 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: Stewart, Dr. John M

Received: May,07,2010 12:52:54

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As a Wildlife Scientist with 45 years of experience in research on the behavior and ecology of endangered species, I understand the importance of

protecting critical habitat for wildlife, while ensuring safe and peaceful wilderness recreation for current and future generations of Americans. Thank you for inviting me to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7907 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: Seibert, Bob

Received: May,07,2010 12:53:03

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7908 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: Farrington, Raymond

Received: May,07,2010 12:53:10

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks and a frequent visitor to Cape Hatteras, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Sincerely,

Raymond Farrington

Correspondence ID: 7909 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. I have seen first-hand the kind of damage that ORVs have inflicted on natural landscapes in upstate New York, on Long Island. I am very concerned to hear that ORVs may soon have year-round access to the beaches of the Cape Hatteras Nation Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who

enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

***** Thank you very much for taking the time to protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again!

Sincerely,

Correspondence ID: 7910 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Kolkey, MFT, Zora L
Received: May.07.2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations.
Zora L. Kolkey, MFT

Correspondence ID: 7911 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May.07.2010 12:53:37
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: As a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore.
I am very concerned that your plan will give too much use to off-road vehicles. A sea shore should be a place to appreciate the ocean and the wildlife that is around. There are many places where these vehicles can be driven where they would not detract from the environment or destroy the ecology. When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
Thank you, Derek R West

Correspondence ID: 7912 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May.07.2010 12:53:37
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID:	7913	Project:	10641	Document:	32596		
Name:	N/A, N/A						
Received:	May,07,2010 12:53:48						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	<p>As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.</p> <p>1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."</p> <p>2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.</p> <p>3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.</p>						
Correspondence ID:	7914	Project:	10641	Document:	32596		
Name:	N/A, N/A						
Received:	May,07,2010 12:53:50						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	Please preserve Cape Hatteras						
Correspondence ID:	7915	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,07,2010 12:53:54						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	Letting off-road vehicles go "off-raod"!!!!!!						
Correspondence ID:	7916	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,07,2010 12:54:00						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	We must keep all our public lands from being altered or damaged so that future generations may enjoy them too.						
Correspondence ID:	7917	Project:	10641	Document:	32596		
Name:	Schoemer, Karen						
Received:	May,07,2010 12:54:05						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	<p>Dear Superintendent Murray,</p> <p>As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.</p> <p>1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."</p> <p>2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.</p> <p>3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.</p>						
Correspondence ID:	7918	Project:	10641	Document:	32596		
Name:	N/A, N/A						
Received:	May,07,2010 12:54:12						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	PRESERVE not allow for DISTRUCTION.						
Correspondence ID:	7919	Project:	10641	Document:	32596		
Name:	B, Jeremiah						
Received:	May,07,2010 12:54:35						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	I feel that Off Road Vehicles should be on a very limited basis. The rigs that are used for this enjoyment are anything but clean. They are regularly						

coated in grease and oil and frequently have leaks of various chemicals. To limit the damage to environment and to keep the tranquility of the area for people walking the beaches and in the area these vehicles should be kept in a restricted use category. I don't feel that they should be banned completely, because I too enjoy off road recreation, but I also am aware of the potential damage that they can cause when an area is opened up to excessive use for these types of vehicles.

Thank you for taking the time to consider my opinion and thoughts among the others sharing their thoughts.

Correspondence ID: 7920 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
I am a citizen, a voter, a community activist, and I have always been a lover of beaches, wilderness, and wildlife. I am a big fan of the National Park system and the National Wilderness system, and I regularly visit our parks and wilderness areas as a camper, hiker and birdwatcher. In brief, I object to wide scale use of our parks for off road motorized vehicles since such use is always detrimental to habitat and wildlife.
As a member of the Moveon.org and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.
Very truly yours, Richard P Stowell

Correspondence ID: 7921 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:54:49
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Fossil-fueled ORVs are unnecessary toys that contribute to pollution, and are noisy and destructive. Those who use them should not be accorded privileged status on public lands. ORVs contribute to obesity and allow users to access (and disfigure) public lands without any specific commitment to acquisition, maintenance and remediation of damage to those lands. ORV access is an expensive "frill" that favors oil companies and vehicle manufacturers at the expense of the environment, the national parks budget, and in these economically troubled times, tax monies that could be better spent keeping the parks themselves open, staffed and maintained.

Correspondence ID: 7922 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: N/A, N/A
Received: May,07,2010 12:54:50
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Elected officials,
PLEASE keep the vehicles and pedestrians off the wildlands for half the year. Wildlife must be preserved for the state to prosper by attracting tourists.

Correspondence ID: 7923 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:54:56
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
I am emailing in support of the "environmentally preferred" Alternative D in the DEIS for the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Off-Road Vehicle Management Plan. This alternative will allow recreational use of the seashore, while protecting vulnerable wildlife species like sea turtles and colonial nesting birds.
Thank you for the opportunity to comment.
Sincerely, Gudrun Thompson Chapel Hill, NC

Correspondence ID: 7924 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: N/A, N/A
Received: May,07,2010 12:54:59
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I really love this area....

Correspondence ID: 7925 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Daly, Julia
Received: May,07,2010 12:55:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Keep our beaches clean!!!! They're under threat from oil spills as it is.

Correspondence ID: 7926 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: N/A, N/A
Received: May,07,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence:

Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
- 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7927 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 12:55:08

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
- 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7928 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 12:55:32

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As we watch what is happening to our Gulf coast it is more important than ever to protect these places so fragile.

Correspondence ID: 7929 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: N/A, N/A

Received: May,07,2010 12:55:35

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
- 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7930 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 12:55:38

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Approving an off road vehicle use on this beach would do permanent damage to wildlife and also be dangerous for pedestrian traffic. We must preserve as many places as possible without vehicle use to keep nature as it was meant to be enjoyed and protected for future generations. There are plenty of other locations people can drive their vehicles without doing so at the Cape Hatteras National Seashore. If vehicles are allowed to drive in this area, there will also be a major increase in trash. This will not only destroy the beauty of the area, but also endanger wildlife by consuming, get caught in it and just general trashing the area. I strongly urge you to NOT allow this to happen by NOT allowing vehicle traffic.

Correspondence ID: 7931 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Miller, Nancy
Received: May,07,2010 12:55:39
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please keep the Hatteras National Seashore quiet and natural so that people can get away from the noisy city and be in a place where they can rest and enjoy nature.
Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 7932 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: N/A, N/A
Received: May,07,2010 12:55:44
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I find it unbelievable that ORV would be allowed free roam over the beaches throughout the year. People come to the Outer Banks to relax and walk along the various beaches, not have to move out of the way of vehicles or hear/smell exhaust.
Not only would this affect the vacationers in a negative way, but what of the plants and wildlife that come to the beaches to nest, roost, or actually live there? Haven't we done enough to destroy beautiful places? Haven't we pushed our way onto enough space? Is it too hard to leave some alone?
Please do not allow this to go through.

Correspondence ID: 7933 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:55:51
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7934 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Feeley, Janet
Received: May,07,2010 12:56:02
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: We must stop ATV's from damaging delicate areas in NC and other parts of the United States. Our eco systems are in danger already and we need to protect them. My family has visited NC several times over the years and each time we visit, we notice changes from sprawl and other environmental damages.
Once these areas are desecrated, they may NEVER recover, please stop it before it happens. We are losing too many of our precious natural areas. Our wildlife is suffering as well, maybe more than us.
Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 7935 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best

examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.
Sincerely, Mark Kupke

Correspondence ID: 7936 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Young, Nancy L L
Received: May,07,2010 12:56:09
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please restrict off-road vehicles on Cape Hatteras.

Correspondence ID: 7937 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: N/A, N/A
Received: May,07,2010 12:56:14
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7938 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: N/A, N/A
Received: May,07,2010 12:56:15
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Off-road vehicles are noisy and they tear up the beach.

Correspondence ID: 7939 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: N/A, N/A
Received: May,07,2010 12:56:16
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I encourage you to rethink allowing ORV traffic in this area on a full-time basis. In order to keep the essence of our national parks, it is imperative that you restrict the use of vehicles in areas such as this. Please consider an alternative to the current plan.
Thank you for your time.

Correspondence ID: 7940 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: N/A, N/A
Received: May,07,2010 12:56:24
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: The seashore is for animals, not for vehicles!

Correspondence ID: 7941 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Hubbard, James
Received: May,07,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. I am unsure why ORV use continues to plague our undeveloped areas. There are plenty of alternatives currently for ORV use, and it seems unnecessary to subject further areas to harm from off-road motoring.
The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina, where I have friends and family. This area is valued by family vacationers, bird watchers and those of us who simply enjoy undeveloped beaches and the opportunity to get away from the noise and chaos of city life. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors, which honestly baffles me. This approach seems unfair and unbalanced, and it fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points:
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
ORV use is known to be environmentally destructive, and I again fail to understand the need for more ORV areas.
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason: "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses ... the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." The intent of Congress was clearly to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
Wilderness is a decreasing and valuable commodity.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations, and I appreciate the opportunity to provide feedback. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan. Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 7942 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:56:31
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: ORVs do not belong in Cape Hatteras NS period.

Correspondence ID: 7943 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Hughes, Andrew
Received: May,07,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
Motorized land vehicle be they cars, ATVs, motorbikes have NO place anywhere on Public Lands except for roads. The ONLY exception I would make is for disabled access.
The rest below is NCPA boiler-plate which I endorse as the next best option to what I have stated above.

===== As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7944 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Potter, Sondra E
Received: May,07,2010 12:56:35
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan

Correspondence ID: 7945 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: N/A, N/A
Received: May,07,2010 12:56:42
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please do not allow ORV at Cape Hatteras. These noisy, polluting machines destroy the environment for those seeking the rare opportunity to enjoy quiet, peaceful beauty. We need to encourage people to walk, to use less fossil fuels. The precious few natural places left should not be turned into amusement parks. Thank you, Ed Guhman

Correspondence ID: 7946 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Voska, Kenneth J
Received: May,07,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft

plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
- 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

***** Thank you very much for taking the time to protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again!

Sincerely,
Kenneth J. Voska

Correspondence ID: 7947 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: N/A, N/A
Received: May.07,2010 12:56:54
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please keep our beaches pristine and available to swimmers and walkers - not to noisy polluting machines that impinge on the solitude, and destroy the plants and animals living there.

Correspondence ID: 7948 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May.07,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
As a member of the NPCA and a supporter of national parks as well as a visitor and vacationer to the Carolinas and their shores, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. YOU of course know how special a resource this area is, with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the well known Outer Banks. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped and less traveled beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement would dramatically change that for this place, since they privilege ORV use over all other visitors. All these possibilities realistically fail to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that are a large part of what make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it can be modified to include the following points.
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Clearly the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. Please do try to preserve this area "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7949 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May.07,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
As a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations", which ORV use certainly does not.
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7950 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

***** Thank you very much for taking the time to protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again!

Sincerely, Janet Falcone

Correspondence ID: 7951 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I SUPPORT the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, IT IS MODIFIED TO INCLUDE AND RECOGNIZE THE FOLLOWING:

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you very much for taking the time to protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again!

Sincerely,

Nan Balaguer

Correspondence ID: 7952 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 12:57:09

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: People can walk the beaches! Or bicycle. It will help reduce American obesity. Please don't encourage national laziness! Golf courses already do as does industry.

Correspondence ID: 7953 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: Mecke, Mike B

Received: May,07,2010 12:57:12

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: National Park Service, USDI

As a former Federal natural resources planner, manager and supervisor, I feel strongly due to personal experience, that ORV have little place inside of National Parks, Refuges or Recreation Areas.

When and where allowed, ORV need to be tightly controlled, supervised and the resources protected - whether beach erosion, water, wildlife, habitat, noise or air pollution.

Whatever vehicles are allowed should be strictly inspected for not only safety, but noise and emissions suppression.

The beaches of America and our precious Federal lands and parks are much more important than a few hours or days of fun for individuals tearing up a beautiful natural resource and damaging the quality of experience for the majority of visitors.

Thank you very much for your consideration.

Mike Mecke

Correspondence ID: 7954 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: N/A, N/A

Received: May,07,2010 12:57:20

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please keep off road vehicles out of Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 7955 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 12:57:24

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7956 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: Stearns, Joan E

Received: May,07,2010 12:57:24

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please keep off-road vehicles out of Cape Hatteras.

Correspondence ID: 7957 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: Morotti , Gloria J

Received: May,07,2010 12:57:41

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Off-the-road vehicles should not be in any park or recreational area. Truly, they are abhorrent in any setting. They serve no purpose other than that of a cheap thrill, and the people who use them need to get a life.

Correspondence ID: 7958 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: McChesney, Tim

Received: May,07,2010 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. My first boss and mentor was under enormous stress at work. He had two ways to relax: (1) he loved to race in road rallies, and (2) he loved to take his family to Cape Hatteras, park the car and spend a week camping on the beach. When I had a family, I took them to Cape Hatteras and we, too enjoyed the solitude and the opportunity to connect with the real world. I believe that it's critically important to preserve this resource as free of off-road vehicles as possible. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Sincerely, Tim McChesney

Correspondence ID: 7959 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: craciun, george J

Received: May,07,2010 12:57:56

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I urge you to reconsider any plans for Cape Hatteras National Seashore, which would allow year round access for off road vehicles (ORV's) at the expense of pedestrians and wildlife. Allowing beaches to be degraded by ORV's with negative impacts to sea turtles, shore birds and other coastal wildlife, could not be considered as acceptable management of these natural resources. A much greater emphasis on wildlife and pedestrian use, minimizing ORV intrusions, is what is required for this area. Please do the right thing by formulating a minimum impact ORV plan which the area can sustain in the long term.

Sincerely,

Correspondence ID: 7960 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 12:57:59

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird

watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7961 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Cohen, Norman
Received: May,07,2010 12:58:08
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: DONT LET OFF ROAD VEHICLES DOMINATE CAPE HATTERAS NATIONAL SEASHORE

Correspondence ID: 7962 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Armistead, Susan C
Received: May,07,2010 12:58:12
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7963 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Mendez, Carlos
Received: May,07,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.
***** Thank you very much for taking the time to protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again!
Sincerely, Carlos Mendez

Correspondence ID: 7964 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Knockemus, Steve
Received: May,07,2010 12:58:18
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,

0011081

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
- 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7965 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Wedlock, Eldon D
Received: May,07,2010 12:58:19
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy pristine, undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, IF it is modified to include and recognize the following points.
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and scientific analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan

Correspondence ID: 7966 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:58:26
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please don't allow Off-road vehicles to spoil the Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Such a move can only result in damage to fragile areas, including plants and wildlife, not to mention disturbance to pedestrians and sightseers.
The national parks and reserves should be places of natural vistas and experiences, not havens for roaring motors and speeding vehicles. There are plenty of other areas for people enjoying that sort of thing to recreate. Please leave some room for peace, quiet and enjoyment of beauty in our country!
Willia Schmidt Madison, WI

Correspondence ID: 7967 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:58:31
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Why the policy you are establishing called an "ORV Access Policy" instead of a "Human access policy"? The policy is about primarily about excluding people from using the parts of the National Recreational Area and not about controlling the safe and environmentally responsible use of ORVs. Why is not more of your plan based on science? Best available science is a buss word and has nothing to do with the actual use of scientific findings. Your us of statistics is laughable. You main use of science and statistics is anecdote. Your proposed policy will almost certainly have very little affect on the populations of the plovers and oyster catchers. There is no effort made to balance the cost against the rewards
It seems that your policy now and in the recent past is based on the self-interest of the park service and a few small groups. You have not taken into account the history, nature and communities of the area.
It seems that the NPS has sytematically ignored the historic use of the area, the good of people that vacation on the Outer Banks and the people that live there.
The NPS has continually talked fairness on the one hand and promoted a single viewpoint on the other. The good of the park, the wildlife, the visitors and the people that live there should be of primary concern. Clearly that has not been the primary concern of the NPS.

Correspondence ID: 7968 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Murbach, Randy
Received: May,07,2010 12:58:42
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that

make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Sincerely,

Randy Murbach

Correspondence ID: 7969 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: Anderson, William D

Received: May.07.2010 12:58:46

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods and is enjoyed by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7970 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May.07.2010 12:59:05

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7971 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May.07.2010 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,

I grew up on the Gulf coast of south Texas and enjoyed Padre Island National Seashore many times as a young boy. Today, I live on the coast of southern California, where I still enjoy the splendor of beautiful beaches. The beaches of North Carolina's Cape Hatteras National Seashore are similarly a nationally significant resource, featuring sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy wild beaches unspoiled by development that has overtaken so much of our coastal regions.

I am thus deeply troubled that all the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement to manage off-road vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore unduely grant ORVs disproportionate use over all other visitor uses. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points:

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all

visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife MUST take precedence over a single form of recreation--ORVs--and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason: "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses..., the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

I am not opposed to ORV use. It is an activity that I enjoy myself. But there is a time and a place for everything in life, and the pristine beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore are not the place for this activity--any more than one would ride a quad into a cathedral!

While I enjoy ORVs, I value the almost-sacred, spirit-renewing effect of our National Park system. It was a truly original American idea, born of the most basic democratic principles that our greatest national resources are to be left as they are for all Americans to enjoy for ever. My family has travelled across our great country so many times enjoying scores of national parks for our vacations, improving our bonds as a family as well as our affection for the beauty of our nation and its central tenets of resource stewardship for all people, for all time.

I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. Please ensure that the primary focus of Cape Hatteras National Seashore is to ensure the unimpaired enjoyment of people without motorized recreation. There are frankly plenty of places which are far more appropriate for such ORV activity. I look forward to your response and seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback on this vitally important matter.

Correspondence ID: 7972 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Dennis, Steve C
Received: May,07,2010 12:59:12
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses..., the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7973 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:59:12
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Earth's environmental history is rife with decisions made in favor of human preferences & activities--usually at the expense of other species. The condition of the planet shows unmistakably that these policies have not only cost innumerable species their habitats & often their very existences--but that we have actually endangered the biosphere itself.
I think it's time we start giving other species a voice in decisions which intimately affect their well-being & very survival; indeed, our own status is inextricably tied with theirs...

Correspondence ID: 7974 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:59:21
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: As a supporter of National Parks, I would like to comment on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore.
This beach is loved by vacationing families, bird watchers and local residents. I'd like to know why ORV users are given priority use of this beach? This is unfair to everyone else. This plan does not protect birds or turtles or any other wildlife.
I support Alternative D with a few changes. Wildlife must be protected over ORV's. This area must be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness and must be used to achieve wildlife recovery efforts. Foot traffic should be given preference over ORV users and ORV use must be kept to a minimum in a restricted area of the beach.
Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 7975 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan. Please isn't it bad enough our shorelines are in jeopardy from off shore drilling??? Can we not care about preserving any pristine beauty and wildlife?? Can't people just enjoy WALKING there - which also would preserve fuel??? Will we not be happy until we have destroyed all beauty in our country??? ***** Thank you very much for taking the time to protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again!

Sincerely,

Correspondence ID: 7976 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:59:31
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: The only motorized vehicles allowed on our public beaches should be those needed to clean and remove trash.

Correspondence ID: 7977 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Heathcoat, Elaine A
Received: May,07,2010 12:59:44
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7978 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 12:59:50
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Off Road Vechiles can ruin the beauty of any National Park, not to mention the noise which invades everyone's space.

Correspondence ID: 7979 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Wood, Barbara L
Received: May,07,2010 12:59:51
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: When I lived in Maryland (45 years)I often visited Cape Hattaras. The presence of off-road vehicles would have been upsetting and totally destroyed the experience.

Correspondence ID: 7980 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

***** Thank you very much for taking the time to protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again!

Sincerely,
Dorothy Elsaesser

Correspondence ID:	7981	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,07,2010 13:00:30						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	Please help						
Correspondence ID:	7982	Project:	10641	Document:	32596		
Name:	Laurson, Ed J						
Received:	May,07,2010 13:00:39						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	Please protect all beach areas in America. We need to save coastal wildlife and from erosion that would occur.						
Correspondence ID:	7983	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,07,2010 13:00:40						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	You MUST reconsider the allowance of Off Road Vehicles in the Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Off Road Vehicles can only damage the area that is intended for passive enjoyment. You must re-think this plan.						
Correspondence ID:	7984	Project:	10641	Document:	32596		
Name:	Kelemen, Frank						
Received:	May,07,2010 13:00:42						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	My family regularly vacations at the Cape Hatteras National Seashore (we have been doing so for the past 20 years). The peace and solitude found walking along the long stretches of virgin beach is a main attraction. Don't spoil it with off road access etc.						
Correspondence ID:	7985	Project:	10641	Document:	32596		
Name:	Matheny, MaryJo H						
Received:	May,07,2010 13:00:45						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	A protected national beach and its wnviorum should be fept as pristine as possible. Keeping ALL vehicles out of the area is a way to start/ Thank you, thank you!						
Correspondence ID:	7986	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,07,2010 13:00:48						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	Just a quick note to tell you I am against extended off road vehicle use at the Cape Hatteras National Seashore. While I am not against ORV's, the segment of population that uses these is small and should not be allowed to dominate the seashore to the extent that others can not enjoy the peace and tranquility of the area. Especially now that the oil slick is contaminating other shores, we need to keep as much clean seashore available for public use. Birds may migrate from the Gulf so extended ORV use would also endanger that.						
Correspondence ID:	7987	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,07,2010 13:00:56						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.						

Correspondence ID: 7988 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: N/A, N/A
Received: May,07,2010 13:01:11
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Save our seashores....all of them!

Correspondence ID: 7989 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 13:01:13
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please do not allow off-road vehicles (or any private vehicles) on National Park lands. ORV destroy habitat, intimidate animals, and create a noise nuisance. Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 7990 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 13:01:17
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Regarding the Cape Hatteras National Seashore ORV Plan, I humbly request that you not add or expand the usage of any motorized vehicles in this peaceful and mostly pristine wilderness area. National Parks comprise a mere 3.6% of the US land area, and many parks already suffer from heavy vehicle traffic, including snowmobiles and ATV's. Our daily lives are filled with enormous amounts of noise and stimulation. Is it too much to ask that a few unspoiled sanctuaries be preserved where one can actually collect his thoughts and enjoy a moment of serenity in a beautiful natural setting? Thanks for this opportunity to comment, Charlie Pick Northfield, IL

Correspondence ID: 7991 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Barber, Terry L
Received: May,07,2010 13:01:25
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: To Whom It May Concern:
Given noise and oil pollution, we need no vehicles of any kind on any protected beaches or parks. I oppose allowing spoiled Americans' who don't know how to enjoy themselves without their toys having such use. People need to learn to be quiet and enjoy the natural setting. They might just learn something they can't learn while sporting around on their toys. Leave nature to itself. We've done enough damage. Sincerely, Terry L. Barber

Correspondence ID: 7992 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Coddington, Tom L
Received: May,07,2010 13:01:36
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Off road vehicles do major damage to the landscape. They should have a very restricted area in which to do that damage. Our National Seashores are not the place for Off Road vehicles. I can't believe that our National Park Service would even consider opening up these protected lands to that kind of destruction! Please keep the beaches and the seashore for the use of pedestrians to enjoy and see wildlife. Thank you, Tom Coddington

Correspondence ID: 7993 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 13:01:37
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7994 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 13:01:40
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please save Cape Hatteras

Correspondence ID: 7995 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: N/A, N/A

Received: May,07,2010 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

My experience of people who use off road vehicles is that they do not have much respect for the environment or the wildlife in the areas in which they are riding. It is just their intent to go into an area, tear it up and leave the largest footprint they can leave without any regard for others who come after them. It is wrong to allow off road vehicles in the Cape Hatteras area because these people will just destroy what everyone has worked so hard to protect.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7996 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,07,2010 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

***** Thank you very much for taking the time to protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again!

Sincerely,

Barbara Lafaver Gleason

Correspondence ID: 7997 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: Farmer, Betsy H

Received: May,07,2010 13:01:49

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7998 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: Hines, Nolan F
Received: May,07,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Mr. Murray,

The wildlife and awe inspiring natural beauty that exists on Cape Hatteras is there for us to enjoy because we have protected it. Please, please, please do not allow more access to ORV's. My family in Ohio has them and enjoys using them. However, anyone who observes areas where ORV's have wider access knows that wildlife populations are altered and decreased and the natural beauty of the area is diminished. There are millions of acres and miles of trails already available to ORV use. Please preserve Cape Hatteras from the negative effects.

Thank you for your consideration, Nolan F. Hines

Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 7999 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: N/A, N/A
Received: May,07,2010 13:01:56
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 8000 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: flannery, rebecca g
Received: May,07,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

***** Thank you very much for taking the time to protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again!

Sincerely,

0011089

please,let this beautiful place stay,relaxing,serene,and pristine! it is is a real treasure!
